The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXVI, No.4 APRIL, 1952

CONTENTS

Moses and the Average Priest — *Robert North, S.J.* — 241

Mother of Divine Grace — *Cyril Vollert, S.J.* — 258

The Very Reverend Walter Farrell, O.P., S.T.M., — *Reginald M. Coffee, O.P.* — 271

A Quest of Thoughts. Part IV — *John K. Ryan* — 279

Easter Eve. Part II — *Philip T. Weller* — 288

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

A Case of Restitution — 308

The Rh Factor and Rhythm — 309

Permission to Use Confessional Knowledge — 309

Sacred Particles — 310

Benediction Difficulties — 310

Mass for the Second Day of Forty Hours' Devotion — 311

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1952, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Correct Way to Wear the Stole 312

Holy Saturday Services 312

Leonine Prayer Difficulty 312

Good Friday 313

Vestments 313

BOOK REVIEWS

Cardinal Spellman's Prayer Book 314

The Concept of the Diocesan Priesthood, *by Joseph Clifford Fenton* 314

Satan, *edited by Père Bruno de Jésus-Marie* 315

The Brighter Vision, *by John V. Ryan* 317

The Considerate Priest, *by Msgr. William J. Kerby* 318

The Marianum

A Quarterly Review of Scientific Mariology

REV. GABRIEL M. ROSCHINI, O.S.M., Editor

- *THE MARIANUM* is the oldest and foremost quarterly review of Mariology.
- It is a polygot publication, having departments for Specific Questions in Mariology, Church Documents, Current Mariological Events, Book Reviews, etc.
- Articles for THE MARIANUM are written by the leading mariologists all over the world.
- NO STUDENT OF MARIOLOGY SHOULD BE WITHOUT IT!

Subscription price, payable in U. S. money or equivalent, for United States, Canada, and the Sterling Area: $4.00 annually; $10.00 for three years. Address subscription communications to: American Province of Servite Fathers, 3111 Van Buren Street, Chicago 12, Illinois, or directly to Servite Fathers, International Marian Commission, Via Del Corso 255-A, Rome, Italy.

MOSES AND THE AVERAGE PRIEST

It has become almost a touchstone of the Catholic faith to say that Moses wrote the books from Genesis to Deuteronomy. The alternative to the Mosaic theory is the "mosaic" theory, according to which these books are a jig-saw puzzle put together out of four documents called JEPD. Reacting against this view, which has become standard among independent scholars, Catholics of every stratum come pleading to their priests, "What *exactly* does the Church say we *have* to believe?"

The average priest knows that there is an official and solemn, though not irreformable, pronouncement of the Church, which declares there is no sufficient reason for denying the tradition of substantial Mosaic authorship.[1] "Well then, Moses is author of the Pentateuch, and that's all there is to it," will be the reply of a sensible, practical-minded pastor who has more important problems on his mind.

But if he be of an imaginative bent, the priest might expand somewhat for his inquirer's benefit: how, after each day's weary march in the desert, when the manna had been rationed, the goats milked, and the culprits stoned, the powerful white-bearded organizer sat awake long hours over the flickering oil-lamp in his tent, filling page after page of papyrus with the neat square Hebrew letters which embodied his diary and his testimony.

More daring spirits among the junior clergy might hint that part of the time Moses dictated these memoirs to a secretary, and that in the course of copying through the centuries some changes crept into the text, erroneous explanatory notes or numbers with an extra zero. But by and large, our Pentateuch text would be just as surely that which proceeded from the creative hand of Moses, as our *Aeneid* is from Virgil.

[1] Responsum Pontificiae Commissionis de Re Biblica, 27 junii 1906; *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, 39 (1906), 377, *Enchiridion Biblicum*, 174. Strictly the binding "minimal sense" of the decree is that the arguments which up to 1906 had been advanced against Mosaic authorship were not conclusive. But the decree was explicitly reaffirmed in the 1948 response to Cardinal Suhard, *AAS*, 40 (1948), 45-48; in which however it is made clear that *from the start* (contrary to what many Catholics had contended) the decree invited a moderate interpretation, e.g. that many of the *laws* were a progressive post-Mosaic development.

Each of these answers, in its way, does credit to the priest in question, as well as to the loyal Catholicity which they have in common. But it is well to remember that each answer is a purely private *commentary* on the authoritative teaching of the Church. And both of these priests might be happily or unhappily surprised to hear the commentaries which some of their fellow-priests throughout the world are making in answer to the same question and on the basis of the same decree.

As for the devout and troubled layman who asked the question, might it not be said that he hoped for an answer somewhat more *catholic* (i.e. universal) than the well-founded private opinion of one busy priest? Or let us say rather that the priest himself, in all honesty, might wish that he had at hand a formula to express the *general tenor* of the answers given by qualified Catholic authorities.

To satisfy such a desire, the present article will undertake to present *each* significant answer advanced by Catholic scholarship on the basis of the 1906 decree. These fall naturally into five groups, according to the respective distance which they set between themselves and the sinister (or "left") JEPD theory.

Catholic Pentateuch Scholarship				
Anti-JEPD		Center	*Pro-JEPD*	
Extreme Right	Right Center	*Neutral*	Left Center	Extreme Left
Deny premisses and conclusions.	Admit premisses, draw different conclusions.	Neither alternative cogent.	Admit some *(literary)* conclusions.	Admit all (literary) conclusions.

By way of conclusion, we will attempt a "composite photograph," including the common traits of all the answers, plus those incidentals which take most moderate cognizance of the arguments advanced by all the disagreeing parties.

ANTI-DOCUMENTARY BLOC

Extreme Right. Since the essential opposition to Mosaic authorship arose, historically considered, from the JEPD or *documentary* hypothesis culminating in Wellhausen, it is natural that the most resolute defenders of Catholic tradition tend to range themselves

diametrically opposite, denying not merely the conclusions but the *premisses* on which JEPD is based.

Leading exponent of this conservative position is the German Bea, who since 1930 has served in important positions connected with the Biblical Institute and the Biblical Commission. The characteristic of Bea's treatment is that he takes as starting-point the *ecclesiastical tradition* of Mosaic authorship and analyzes its implications. Only when he has thus *settled* the matter does he take up the tenets of the Wellhausen school, which he handles as objections, and refutes with solid erudition and critical acumen.[2]

Scrupulously careful to acknowledge the grains of truth wherever they appear, he shows no sympathy for uncritical ultra-conservatism. His most progressive contribution is his insistence that the variations in diction among the alleged components of the Pentateuch are only a *phase* of a far ampler problem. The *whole* Hebrew bible exhibits a homogeneity of diction which fits a period of at most 200 years. Therefore the whole Old Testament, and not merely the Pentateuch, must in the course of copying have been subjected to a continuous *modernization of diction*, so that in no case can the claim be seriously advanced that we possess the *very words* as Moses wrote them. Rightly of course, Bea sees in this no objection to *substantial Mosaic* authorship; but he does see in it a fatal blow to the diction-argument which is the strongest support of JEPD.[3]

Evidently as a mouthpiece of *doctrina catholica* Bea has an importance proportioned to his twenty years as rector of the Biblical, editor of Biblica, and consultor of the Roman Curia. With good reason, therefore, Catholic works of a more general nature or for *seminary* use follow Bea's approach faithfully; thus Miller-Metzinger.[4]

The extremely copious and up-to-date treatment of Prado (Spain) gives at first the impression of greater largeness. Though

[2] Augustinus Bea, *De pentateucho*[2] (Institutiones Biblicae 2) Rome, 1933 ([1]1928).

[3] Bea, *De pentateucho*[2] 60; cf. p. 9, sense in which Mosaic authorship pertains to theology (Bea states it is not *defined*, but assigns no other note, not even *communis et certa*); p. 29 "authentiam sensu quodam maxime stricto defendit L. Murillo *El Génesis* (Romae 1914)."

[4] Athanasius Miller and Adalbert Metzinger, *Introductio specialis in vetus testamentum*[5] in Höpfl's *Introductionis compendium* (Rome 1946), 15-112.

he states "differences of vocabulary, grammar, and style, and even the so-called 'doublets' noted in favor of JEPD, can be accounted for even if substantial Mosaic authenticity is retained,"[5] he does not, in fact, "account for" them, but denies them. He praises recent researches (Von Rad, Noth) insofar as they give reason to hope that "the substantial Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch will be acknowledged by the critics at least in the sense that the principal records of historical tradition and of legislation which it contains are referred to the Mosaic age, and that even in the literary form which we possess, the Mosaic and pre-Mosaic outlines can be detected beneath the later accretions and changes" (p. 299). He holds that "the literary form of the narratives and laws may be admitted non-Mosaic"; Moses' own temperament is reflected chiefly in the J and D documents, though in D may cautiously be seen the hand of Josue, as of Aaron (!) in P. But ultimately Prado really admits no more than minor glosses or reformulations.

Even closer to Bea, though appearing ten years after him, is the useful work of Steinmueller, which gives us in the United States almost our only look at the question.[6] Shortly after the appearance of this pioneer work of American Catholic scholarship, its author was appointed a Consultor to the Biblical Commission.

It must not be imagined that Catholics have a monopoly of the extreme right. A steady trickle of Protestant and Jewish scholars continue to uphold pre-Astruc views of Mosaic authorship; though in general even those who criticize Wellhausen most sharply cling firmly to the basic tenets of JEPD.[7]

Right Center. Other weighty Catholic scholars, while agreeing in principle that the basic lines of JEPD are erroneous and incompatible with Catholic doctrine, nevertheless approach the problem more from the standpoint of *a posteriori* facts which have been solidly established by the techniques of literary criticism.

Leader of this group is Heinisch, who by quantity of output and influence on independent scholarship is the outstanding Catholic

[5] J. Prado, *De sacra veteris testamenti historia* in H. Simon, *Praelectiones biblicae* (Turin 1949), 285.

[6] John E. Steinmueller, *A Companion to Scripture Studies 2. Special Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York 1942), 14-69.

[7] Bea, "Der Heutige Stand der Pentateuchfrage" *Biblica*, 16 (1935), 177, 199; cf. "Biblische Kritik und Neuere Forschung" *Stimmen der Zeit*, 114 (1928), 401-412.

Pentateuch-exegete. In his numerous commentaries Heinisch professes an almost scornful rejection of the documentary hynothesis.[8] But he shows an extraordinary perceptiveness for the force of the evidences amassed by the Wellhausen school. To the powerful arguments based on *doublets* (two or more partially divergent narrations of apparently the same event) and *anachronisms*, he answers, "Agreed. So what?" He thinks, and demonstrates by prestigious feats of literary criticism, that these undeniable obstacles to integralist Mosaic authorship can be adequately surmounted by *bracketing* copious post-Mosaic additions made over a period of 300 years, and quantitatively outweighing the Mosaic contribution. Though these are necessarily *inspired*, they are in some cases explicit or implicit *citations* from existing documents. This exegetic procedure has been widely acclaimed by Catholics as fulfilling both the letter and the spirit of the Biblical Commission decree; while no non-Catholic overlooks the skill of Heinisch's constructive analysis. Indeed it must be called a real dispensation of Providence that so courageous a leader has arisen to defend the Catholic cause with the tools which even Catholics were tempted to regard with suspicion.

Another vigorous free-lancer is Sanda (Czechoslovakia), whose fierce answers to the documentarists often embody highly progressive concessions on the *mode* of composition of the Pentateuch. "By the very fact that the hypercritics direct their attacks almost exclusively against the ultra-conservative view, today defended by no one, that the Pentateuch from beginning to end in its present form was written by Moses, they shoot past their mark and labor to prove what no one denies; whilst against the assumption of Mosaic *materials* and post-Mosaic composition their weapons are for the most part futile."[9] Sandra allows as post-Mosaic some fifteen chapters, ascribing to Josias the pivotally important "centralization

[8] Paul Heinisch, *Das Buch Genesis* (Bonn 1930), *Das Buch Exodus* (Bonn 1934), *Das Buch Leviticus* (Bonn 1935), *Das Buch Numeri* (Bonn 1936).

[9] A. Sanda, *Moses und der Pentateuch*, Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 9/4 (Münster 1924), 388. This judgment is a two-edged sword. Sanda himself hammers against non-textcritical presumptions which may have been cardinal to Wellhausen, but certainly were not to the ablest later defenders of literary JEPD: specifically that the *content* of the four documents does not stem basically from a (pre-) Mosaic date; or that (miraculous) revelation is *a priori* impossible.

of cultus" (*Dt.* 12:13). Though he calls "worthless guessing" the opinion that Moses had some other secretary besides Josue (*Ex.* 17:14), he states categorically that Josue must have written up the (present) Pentateuch in 1190, about ten years after the death of Moses "because before that he would not have had sufficient leisure" (p. 396). Gruffly arbitrary as he is, he yet brings to light treasures of profound critical research.[10]

CENTER PARTY

Some Catholic scholars maintain that *neither* the documentary contentions *nor* their refutations can so far be accepted as conclusive.

Here are some conclusions of the trenchant *a posteriori* investigation of the Bavarian Goettsberger: "Our specific researches have shown up sometimes to the advantage of the conservatives and sometimes of the critical trend. In decisive essentials we were unable to admit the critical positions, and therefore the Graf-Wellhausen Pentateuch theory must be essentially rejected. But ... it seems needful to acknowledge some errors of the past.... In our present text the smaller elements (letters, syllables, words, phrases) can be proved to have been incorporated on a strangely mechanical basis, yet in pursuit of a recognizable philological method, for the sole purpose of preserving them from annihilation. It seems clear that the same careful mechanical methodical compilation-technique was extended to stichs, verses, paragraphs, and even more extensive sections of the text, so that it is impossible to draw an essential distinction between textual and literary criticism."[11] So admirably objective and independent is Goettsberger that he has been acclaimed by *both* the conflicting Catholic blocs as plainly favoring their position.

Robert, now editor of the influential *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, in his published works exhibits a certain official neutrality. But he indicates that the latest development of *Gattungsforschung* (tracing the previous *oral* tradition of the respective "sagas") tends

[10] Note on p. 53 his amusing *Quennenscheidung* to prove Schiller's *Cassandra* the work of separate authors. Yet on p. 2 he seems to concede that "Homer" is an author only by popular accommodation, contrary to a favorite anti-JEPD argument (Fernández, Closen).

[11] Johann Goettsberger, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Herders Theologische Grundrisse (Freiburg/B 1928), 112.

rather to *confirm* than to disturb the basic contentions of JEPD. He is especially forceful in his insistence on the scientific validity of the *cumulative proof*. The variants in diction among the alleged four documents can in any given case be accounted for by chance or by some alternative principle; but the extraordinary convergence of so many "patterns" acquires an independent probative force. If in his oral teaching at the Paris *Institut Catholique* Robert more outspokenly defends JEPD, even to the extent of distinguishing its *valid evolutionary presuppositions* from its false anti-supernatural bias, he has nevertheless chosen to commit himself in print rather to the proposition that out-of-hand *rejection* of the documentary tenets is unwarranted.[12]

The continuer of Pirot's *Sainte Bible*, Clamer, is in his commentary for the most part a pallid echo of Heinisch, punctured by hints of documentary tendency in the form of plaintive rhetorical questions.[13]

For the English-speaking world it must suffice to mention here an article by Biblical Institute Professor Robert A. Dyson, soon to appear in England, but already in substance made public in Rome in the form of a popular and well-received lecture on "The Higher Criticism," Jan. 14, 1951. After a sober exposition of the grave defects in Wellhausen's position, he concludes that nevertheless no one has so far produced a synthesis of the literary evidence, strong enough to displace it; and that today many Catholics acknowledge the existence in Genesis of those strata which by ordinary terminology are called JEP, in the composition of which Moses had a large share and "exerted a profound influence both as author and as legislator."

[12] A. Robert (-A. Tricot), *Initiation biblique*[2] (Paris 1948), 102. On p. 100 he oversimplifies: "Goettsberger accepte l'hypothèse des quatre documents." On the *cumulative proof* he cites H. Pinard de la Boullaye, "Essai sur la convergence des probabilités," revised from *Revue néo-scolastique* (1919), 394-418; (1920) 5-36; and reedited in *Étude comparée des religions* (Paris 1929), 2, 509-554, "ses méthodes."

[13] Albert Clamer, *Lévitique, Nombres, Deutéronome*, in Pirot's *Sainte Bible* (Paris 1946), especially pp. 12-16. In Italy the celebrated work of Giuseppe Ricciotti, *Storia d'Israele* (Turin 1932), 1, 132, 271; (1934) 2, 90, though condemning Wellhausen's archaeological unawareness, admits a rather advanced redaction of Deuteronomy, and an intense compilational activity during the Exile, whereby was formed about the Mosaic nucleus an ample *corpus juridicum* and *corpus historicum*.

PRO-DOCUMENTARY BLOC

Extreme Left. Historically speaking, the 1906 decree of Mosaic authorship was a reaction against the documentary theory, which had just reached its apogee and was regarded yearningly by some Catholics.[14] In this background, it is significant that the positive tenets of the (unnamed) documentarists are not condemned, but only their negative conclusion that Moses could not have been the responsible author.

Encouraged by this reticence, a certain wing of Catholic scholarship immediately went to work to prove that the *essential* contentions of Wellhausen could be recast in such a form as to be perfectly compatible with the decree. Thus the French Jesuit Brucker, disclaiming the "all-or-none system" in a chapter called *What is acceptable in the documentary theory*, declares "It is perfectly legitimate to hold that the author of the Pentateuch proceeded by way of successive composition, producing separately several writings, each of which has its proper object and unity. . . . It is not necessary that Moses himself should have made or directed the ultimate redaction. . . . It may be that three or four documents edited under the supervision of Moses . . . long existed separately. The moment of their definitive fusion may be set as late as the Exile or Esdras. . . . It is not necessary that the four documents should have undergone the modernizing process to the same de-

[14] In Germany, A. Scholz, *Zeit und Ort der Entstehung der Bücher des Alten Testament* (Würzburg 1893), 30, held that the one single Mosaic law-book was divided into various fascicles of interest to particular groups. 900 years of copying left its mark on the fascicles, which were reunited by the priestly schools in Babylon. Paul Vetter, "Die literarkritische Bedeutung der alttestamentlichen Gottesnamen," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 85 (1903), 520-47 ff., holds that divine names were used differently at different periods of history, and that while Moses wrote a history of the Exodus and some laws, a twofold patriarchal history arose under the Judges, while the "sayings of Moses" were handed down also in some special editions (as Dt.). In America, Francis E. Gigot, *Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament*[2] (New York 1901), 137-39, claimed that the internal evidence in favor of the documentary theory may be dissociated from the objectionable features which rationalists embodied in it; and that the parallel with Tatian's *Diatessaron* favors the possibiilty of such composition. Von Hügel's essay on Pentateuch sources was published also in America, as "The Historical Method and the Documents of the Hexateuch" *Catholic University Bulletin* (Washington 1908).

gree. In fact the contrary becomes highly probable when we reflect on their difference in character and aim. It is at once obvious that P must have been retouched a great deal more than JE."[15]

This tendency reached a certain culmination in Touzard.[16] His gives the impression of a carefully reasoned and theologically guarded presentation. It was acknowledged as a "notable service to apologetics" by Fernández, then Rector of the Biblical Institute, in an article otherwise devoted to attacking the *scientific* basis of the whole theory.[17] But Touzard was presently disapproved by the Holy Office with the censure "Cannot safely be taught."[18]

One is tempted to theorize on the nuance of "unsafe" as distinguished from "untrue," or to isolate within Touzard's treatment such unnecessary blemishes as its overconfident emphasis on the *secretaries*. But it is the Holy See which pronounced the article unsafe; and it is for the Holy See to explain, if it chooses, why it is unsafe. Doubtless an established theologian might attempt to

---

It must not be forgotten that the quintessence of JEPD, namely that diction-variants prove Genesis composed of separate documents, was invented by a Catholic (converted from Calvinism) Jean Astruc, *in defense of Mosaic authorship*. (He considered Ex.-Dt. written entirely by Moses.) Note too that Jerome *Adversus Helvidium*, *MPL*, 23, 190 had already faced the problem of literary rearrangement: "Sive Moysen dicere volueris auctorem Pentateuchi, sive Esdram eius instauratorem operis, non recuso." And in the heterodox but very ancient Pseudo-Clementine Homilies 3.47, *MPG*, 2, 141, we read, "The law of God was given unwritten by Moses to the seventy wise men to be handed on, in order that by tradition it might be enforced. After the assumption of Moses, it was written down by someone, but not by Moses, because in the Law itself it is written, 'And Moses died.' [The scroll perished in a fire under Nabuchodonosor, a proof that it was composed orally; otherwise the prophet would have been deluded in writing down what was destined to be destroyed!]."

[15] Joseph Brucker, *L'église et la critique biblique: ancien testament*, (Paris 1908), 143-48; similarly Gabriel Huvelin "Pour l'étude du Pentateuque" *Études*, 115 (1908), 766-73, approvingly reviews Alfons Schulz, *Doppelberichte im Pentateuch*, Biblische Studien 13/1 (Freiburg/B 1908) and (non-Catholic) Jonathan Kräutlein, *Die Sprachlichen Verschiedenheiten in den Hexateuchquellen* (Leipzig 1908).

[16] J. Touzard, "Moïse et Josue," *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique* (Paris 1919), 2, 695-860.

[17] Andrés Fernández, "La crítica reciente y el Pentateuco," *Biblica*, 1 (1920), 176; p. 198 draws an effective parallel with the now discredited Homeric dissection.

[18] *AAS*, 12 (1920), 158.

indicate the historical or internal grounds motivating one or other probable interpretation, which subsequently might receive the tacit or formal approval of the Vatican. But this is a path not lightly to be trod by any casual comer. The more normal procedure is simply to conclude that the attempt to reconcile the 1906 decree with Wellhausen along the lines proposed by Touzard is incompatible with Catholic doctrine.

That the danger-line was a tenuous one is proved by the fact that almost immediately in Germany Nikel published a theory very akin to Touzard's, which never provoked any ecclesiastical disapproval. Even Bea's unfavorable review cites from the preface (by Heinisch) "he sacrificed himself for love of truth, and that was for him identical with love of the Church," as justifying his (Bea's) taking issue with so able and meritorious a Catholic, who would have wanted "free pro and con on so important an issue, so that by scientific discussion the solution may be found."[19] Nikel rejects, as reminiscent of modern situations rather than the simple conditions of the Mosaic age, the assumption of a staff of collaborators. This seems an allusion to Touzard; though the decree regarding him is conspicuously unmentioned (Heinisch explains the defective bibliography by the fact that the work was five years in the press, but the *imprimatur* is of 1924). Nikel's own theory: "On the basis of the written historical and legal material left by Moses, as well as other written documents and oral traditions, two or more authors after the time of Moses and independently of one another wrote histories of revelation. These post-Mosaic histories were later united. . . . Thus the literary heritage of Moses was supplemented. Our Pentateuch was the result of this literary development, which is to be considered an organic growth. . . . [After rejecting Wellhausen's views on the evolution of religion, which stamp the whole theory as a "hypothesis of fraud"] it must be conceded that much in the Pentateuch is of post-Mosaic origin; but that ***nothing*** is Mosaic cannot be demonstrated [!]. . . . Regarding the potent work which has been done on Pentateuch criticism in the last hundred years, we must speak with the great-

[19] Bea in *Biblica*, 6 (1925), 226. He objects chiefly that Nikel fell a victim to the literary-critical documentary position instead of "building out of the ruins of Wellhausen . . . a solution uniting scientific results with the demands of Catholic tradition."

est caution. Thus it must be admitted that many important questions, such as the *dating* of J, E, D, and P, are not yet sufficiently clear."[20]

In general, however, the extreme left has been avoided because it is a position from which non-Catholics themselves are receding. Wellhausen was totally unacquainted with the archaeological evidence which is today the greatest single factor in biblical exegesis. Hence it is almost a foregone conclusion that a rigorous acceptance of his views cannot be considered scientific.

Left Center. More numerous and weighty are the Catholic authorities who favor the acceptance of *some* only of the purely literary conclusions of JEPD.

The great Lagrange, who in the many-sidedness of his genius gave his name to an era in Catholic biblical study, proposed already in 1894 that view of an extensive post-Mosaic development of the *legislation*, which in 1947 was authoritatively approved by the Biblical Commission.[21] Sad to say, his farseeing views were regarded with suspicion by many Catholics, who professed to see in him a target of the 1906 decree, especially when in 1912 his name was cryptically appended to a decree forbidding access of seminarians to questionable works.[22] Sacrificing his private views to Catholic harmony, Lagrange thereupon confined his research mostly to the New Testament, and attained that eminence which is now universally recognized. Only in his last hours did he complete the exposition of his views on Genesis which had been silently maturing through those many years: Moses had reasons for composing two separate accounts, E by himself before Horeb, and J with a collaborator after Horeb. On the basis of these two *memoirs*, the more theoretical summary called P was composed at a later date.[23]

[20] Johannes Nikel, *Grundriss der Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Münster 1924), 52, 86.

[21] M.-J. Lagrange, "Les sources du Pentateuque (congrès de Fribourg 1897)" *Revue biblique*, 7 (1898), 10-32; Letter to Cardinal Suhard, *AAS*, 40 (1948), 45-48.

[22] *AAS*, 4 (1912), 530: "similis spiritus commentaria in Scripturas . . . ceu scripta plura P. Lagrange." Compare Richard T. Murphy, "Moses and the Pentateuch," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 11 (1949), 165-78.

[23] M.-J. Lagrange, "L'authenticité mosaique de la Génèse et la théorie des documents," *Revue biblique*, 47 (1938), 163-83.

Junker had already applied the Lagrange theory of *legal* development specifically to Deuteronomy.[24] The very recent work of Chaine indicates the division of Genesis into E, J, and P sources, but the author's own judgment on the question is left obscure.[25] Meanwhile the Czech Stoderl defended a theory of evolution of the laws which up to the 1947 decree was considered audacious.[26] Cazelles defends Moses as author of D in germ, "be this germ no more than the Decalogue"! In Spain, Colunga holds the Pentateuch problem to be a matter of later additions by *inspired* authors.[27]

By a happy irony, Lagrange's article gave the biblical world its only access to another theory which he considered antagonistic to his own, but which actually exhibits far more of kinship than of difference. In 1937, the brilliant Vice-Rector of the Biblical Institute, Vaccari, was called upon to give a lecture on the Pentateuch Question in the presence of Pope Pius XI. The *Osservatore Romano* recounts how at the completion of the discourse, the Holy Father effusively expressed his satisfaction.[28] What was this theory which prompted such enthusiastic approval from the supreme arbiter of Catholic doctrine? Its essential is that we have literary proof of two recensions of Proverbs and other Old Testament books, but especially of the Psalter; Ps. 14 and 53 differ only by the substitution of the name Yahweh for Elohim! *Prov.* 25:1 speaks of a *transcription* or recension of this book by Ezechias. Similarly the (nuclear) Pentateuch written by Moses was handed

[24] Hubert Junker, *Das Buch Deuteronomium* (Bonn 1933), 14-16.

[25] J. Chaine, *Le livre de la Génèse*, Lectio Divina 3 (Paris 1949), 14-15, 479 f. The four sources are declared "generally acknowledged today," though sub-dissection beyond these four documents is "too subtle and subjective." On the tardy dating of these documents, Chaine exposes the critical position clearly and not unsympathetically, and Lagrange's views even more favorably, but without indicating clearly his own allegiance.

[26] Wenzel Stoderl, *Das Gesetz Israels nach Inhalt und Ursprung*, Beiträge zur Einleitung ins Alte Testament, 1 (Marienbad 1933), 1-6. Similar developments were admitted in a more conservative treatment by Gottfried Hoberg, *Moses und der Pentateuch*, Biblische Studien, 10/4 (Freiburg/B 1905), 53-69; 123; *Die Genesis*[2] (Freiburg/B 1908), xxx.

[27] Henri Cazelles, *Le Deutéronome*, Jérusalem Sainte Bible (Paris 1950) introd.—Alberto Colunga, "El problema del Pentateuco y los últimos pontificios," *Estudios bíblicos*, 10 (1951), 314.

[28] *Osservatore Romano*, Sept. 23, 1937; also Sept. 4, col. 1; compare *La Croix* (Paris), Oct. 27, 1937.

down in two geographically distinct schools of copyists, between which prevailed local peculiarities. Eventually the two recensions became so divergent that it was thought necessary to combine them: in which operation now one, now another, sometimes *both* (doublets) were retained.[29] To Lagrange's quip "Why only *two*? Is that some law of literary criticism?" Vaccari respectfully answered, in repeating the lecture a year later at Brussels, that he personally had discovered evidence only for two: "Let us agree on the fundamentals, and we can work out the details later: *la vraie science n'avance qu'à petits pas.*"[30] But apart from the detail of number, he admits the cogency of the parallel with Tatian's *Diatessaron* (strongly opposed by some conservatives): the more especially since the Gospels were precisely variant "recensions" of a basic catechesis, just as the Pentateuch documents are claimed to be. Speaking in the Pope's presence, Vaccari had very interestingly compared the original composition of the Pentateuch with the redaction of a Papal document, in which specialists of the respective doctrinal and literary forms play their part! The above extracts are drawn directly from the lecturer's original manuscripts. That so significant a theory should never have been published *in extenso* by its author must strike one as astonishing and possibly even as sinister. Yet it may be stated directly on the authority of Vaccari himself that the sole obstacle to its publication was lack of time due to the press of urgent scientific obligations.

Recently published, some fifty years after its formulation, the Pentateuch theory of Van Hoonacker distinguishes calmly between Wellhausen's unacceptable theories of religious-cultic evolution, and his acceptable literary hypothesis, especially regarding the development of the laws in their narrative cadre.[31] He regards the

[29] Vaccari as reported in *Verbum Domini*, 17 (1937), 367-78; *Revue biblique*, 47 (1938) 169-72.

[30] "Le Dualisme Littéraire," September 5, 1938; reported in *Actes du XX Congrès International des Orientalistes* (Louvain 1940) 274-5.

[31] A. van Hoonacker, *De compositione litteraria et de origine mosaica hexateuchi disquisitio historico-critica* [posthumously] edited by Josef Coppens, Verhandelingen der vlaamse Academie Letteren 11/11 (Brussels 1949). Coppens (p. 17) claims to give Van Hoonacker's theory purely for its historical interest, not discussing its validity; he does not distinguish Van Hoonacker's own notes from the (allegedly negligible) transitions added by the editor! Compare also P. van Imschoot, "Variae de origine Pentateuchi sententiae" *Collationes Gandavenses*, 7 (1924), 85-90.

literary conclusions of JEPD as "ineluctable," and handles the objections that such a phenomenon could not have passed unnoticed for centuries, or is against inspiration (p. 56). He shows that the so-called four documents do not each exhibit the unity of a single author, but themselves are of different ages and styles (p. 61). He brings into the discussion a most pertinent reference to Bellarmine: "Until the time of Esdras the Scriptures were not edited in the form of books available in easy and convenient form, but were dispersed among various annals and papers [4 K 22 . . .]. But it was Esdras who after the captivity collected and edited them in a single corpus, adding to Deuteronomy the last chapter concerning the life of Moses, and various other transitional remarks."[32]

Van Hoonacker's present successor at Louvain is already well known to English readers from the fine translation of his work on *The Old Testament and the Critics*. In a later (French) edition, Coppens concedes as critically established the documents P, D, and JE, but is unwilling to admit as proved any E different from J (whereas Vaccari holds precisely J and E as basic!). The Flemish scholar questions whether D is perhaps later in definitive redaction than P; and stresses emphatically that the jig-saw technique of textual criticism is passé and boring.[33] The literary deposits of the Old Testament are to be traced rather in a horizontal than in a vertical direction; *each* of the "documents" carries back the *same* traditions to Moses—and beyond![34] Coppens focuses the progressive achievements of more recent Catholics,[35] though in his

[32] Bellarmine, *Controversiae* (Milan 1721), 1, 166.

[33] J. Coppens, *Histoire critique des livres de l'ancien testament*[3] (Brussels 1942), 115.

[34] Coppens, *Histoire critique*[3] [=[1]1938, *The Old Testament and the Critics*, translated by E. A. Ryan and E. W. Tribbe (Paterson 1942), 106; cf. p. 37 "Since recent investigations have not led to any generally acceptable conclusions, Wellhausen's prophecy has not been entirely discredited. His system has not had to make way for another and better-grounded hypothesis"; p. 50 "the vagaries and personal caprice of certain offshoots of the great school of Wellhausen, compromised in no small measure the system of the masters."]

[35] Coppens, *Histoire critique*[3], 186 = Ryan-Tribbe, 152: "Perhaps [Vaccari] would not be opposed to admitting [besides J and E] others, for example a Deuteronomic revision. . . . What is interesting . . . is the prominence given to the alternations (the Mosaic core being [French rather: tends to be] understood more or less as Lagrange would desire) [!]—and the initiative taken by the professor of the Biblical Institute to have the

judgment on their predecessors he might more justly have recognized that even modest advances of a pioneer require manful struggle.[36]

CONCLUSION FOR THE AVERAGE PRIEST

What then is the official teaching of the Church on the Pentateuch question? No one of the five opinions given above has the weight of an authentic decision. They are all acceptable private commentaries on ecclesiastical decrees and traditions. Accordingly insofar as one could sum up these divergent views into their common denominator, he would be in possession of the "Catholic doctrine." It is true that the Holy See could tomorrow pronounce authoritatively accepting one or rejecting another of the alternatives now cultivated by Catholics; but such a decree is not at present foreseeable.

Moses, then, personally wrote down brief portions of the original Torah, a *law* with historical supplements, both based on earlier formulations. The rest of the nuclear Torah was composed either verbatim by himself, or by rhapsodist-scribes under his direction. It is possible that at a later period of his life he composed a *second* work, covering the same material from a different point of view. Bea holds this for D, Lagrange would extend it to the distinction between J and E. But it is also quite tenable that during his life-

---

problems peaceably resubmitted to careful investigation." *Histoire critique*[3] [not in Ryan-Tribbe] "Clamer p. 224 goes so far as to cite this remark of H. Dumeste [*Revue biblique* 46 (1937) 614]: 'What is more important than these determinations of detail, is the principle of the fundamental character of Mosaism, and the development of Israelite law in its spirit and along its line: and it is not the least of Heinisch's merits that he faced this with absolute honesty.' A significant sentence, which brings us much closer, if I am not mistaken, to the position of Van Hoonacker and others once blamed by Mangenot, and even to the solution proposed by the lamented Touzard, than to those compromise-hypotheses in which Mangenot, Brucker, and others thought they foresaw the salvation of Catholic science."

[36] *Histoire critique*[3], 110 [not in Ryan-Tribbe]: "F. von Hummelauer (d. 1913) never produced a coherent established system; his works represent a curious *mélange* of bold views and of odd speculations which brought a laugh to Père Lagrange and Alfred Loisy"; p. 111 "Brucker never had any other ambition than to create and popularize a wholly opportunist system of compromise."

time Moses handed down to the rhapsodists for preservation only a single unitary Torah.

This text was undoubtedly put in writing from the start, but merely as an aid to memory, since *oral transmission* was considered normative. In this process it underwent a progressive modernization of diction, probably carried on variously in various schools. The *priests* were the official custodians, and had the right and obligation to expand the original text either by new *laws* clarifying the older ones in the light of changing circumstances, or by *theological summaries* serving as framework to the history (Heinisch).

But the Torah was also a unique source of entertainment and civil history, and as such was devotedly exploited by lay groups. When the Kingdom was split in 929 B.C., each half tended to emphasize those elements of the Mosaic heritage which were to the glory of their respective region (E Ephraim, the North; J Juda, the South), though never daring to introduce any *substantial change*.

As a step toward some popular movement of reunion between North Israel and Juda, the two nationalistic recensions of the Magna Charta were fused into a unity—a unity of compromise, in which enough of each was retained to keep both parties content, since the *substance* was already identical in both (Vaccari).

It is tempting to see in Deuteronomy the literary form which corresponds most proximately to what we would expect of the great popular organizer. Its oratorical forcefulness was probably cherished especially within the prophetic-reforming group of early Israel, not however excluding a certain development. The book discovered in the Temple under Josias may bear some relation to this nuclear Torah.

Meanwhile the sacerdotal activity, which had been continuing industriously in its purely religious sphere, came to assume a more important part even in the civil government. Especially during the Exile, when the royal house was dispersed, the people looked to Ezechiel and the other priests as their natural principle of unity. It was at such a time that the priestly recension may have been taken as a base into which all the variants were methodically incorporated (Goettsberger), and which was thenceforward promulgated officially as the sole admissible Torah—our Pentateuch.

Unde concludes: Moses is the author of the Pentateuch: the whole Pentateuch and all its parts. But his authorship relates to the *substance,* as was insisted by the Biblical Commission from the start. The *literary form* in which the Pentateuch exists at present is proximately due to its transmission and progressive modernization in two or more schools, of slightly divergent dialects and literary principles. While submissively awaiting further direction from the Holy See, the Catholic may legitimately envision to himself the historical process by which this breakup and refitting took place.

ROBERT NORTH, S.J.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Rome

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the April, 1902, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* the leading article, contributed by Fr. V. McNabb, O.P., is entitled "Mr. Spencer Jones' Essay toward Reunion." Fr. McNabb discusses the proposals of Mr. Jones in his "Essay" dispassionately and sympathetically, but admits that it does not offer any practical plan toward "reunion." However, many would disagree with Fr. McNabb's optimistic statement: "If the entire English Church were at the level of High Churchmen, then would reunion seem not to be despaired of." . . . Fr. Eneas H. Goodwin contributes an interesting article on the prophet Hosea, under the title "A Messenger of Divine Love." . . . Fr. A. MacDonald writes briefly on the concept of memory as proposed by St. Thomas. . . . Fr. W. Stockley contributes an article entitled "The Mind of Rome in Church Music." This article makes it clear that a strong movement was under way even before the time of Blessed Pius X for the reform of church music. The author calls for a more extensive use of Gregorian chant and for the singing of the entire portion of the *proprium* of the Mass which is supposed to be rendered by the choir. . . . In the Conference section it is stated, in reply to a question, that Easter water, even though it has its immediate purpose as a sacramental during the Easter period, may be kept and used even afterward, since "as long as there is virtue in fresh resolves to lead a life worthy of our baptismal pledge, so long remains the efficacy of the water blessed for the purpose." . . . We are informed that a society of priests entitled the "Father Mathew Union of Total Abstainers" was recently formed in Ireland. . . . This issue also contains summaries of recent theology, philosophy and scriptural studies.

F. J. C.

MOTHER OF DIVINE GRACE

Philosophers of history have set themselves the task of discovering and formulating an explanation of the universe. Their efforts are confined to the level of the natural world. Since all nature is orientated toward a supernatural end, the theology of history must take over where the philosophy of history is obliged to leave off. The theology of history, in turn, is based on the sources of revelation, which sums up the record of the universe in two words, or rather two persons: Adam and Jesus Christ. The material world is for man, and man himself is for Christ, the foundation,[1] the model,[2] and the end, under God, of the human race and of all reality.[3] But in fidelity to revelation, especially as clarified by Tradition, we must bring forward a second parallel, that between Eve and Mary. At the side of the first man there stands the first woman, mother of all the living; at the side of Christ stands Mary, Mother of all the redeemed. And that introduces yet a third parallel, between mankind and the Church, Mystical Body of Christ. At the origin of the race, Eve was the associate and wife of Adam; these two are the parents of all men whom God, in His divine goodness, destined for eternal life. But what Adam and Eve could not distinctly perceive was that the race which was to spring from them would not reach its sublime goal without the conjoined action of a new Adam and a new Eve, who were to impart to the first pair's posterity the life of grace.

Where Christ is, there is Mary; and where Christ acts, there Mary acts too, not by title of equality with Him, but as assistant providentially assigned. This truth stands forth clearly if we pass in review a number of striking incidents in the lives of Jesus and His Mother. Even a summary examination discloses the enduring union between Christ and Mary, and by way of consequence, the

[1] "Other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus" (*1 Cor.* 3:11).

[2] "Whom He foreknew, He also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of His Son" (*Rom.* 8:29).

[3] "You are Christ's, and Christ is God's" (*1 Cor.* 3:23). "And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then the Son also Himself shall be subject to Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all" (*1 Cor.* 15:28).

continuous influence Mary had in conferring grace. A survey of the activity Mary shared with Christ leads to the inevitable conclusion: therefore now too, and for all time, the supernatural life of the Mystical Body depends, of course in a subsidiary way, on Mary, our Mother.

The vision of salvation to come began to emerge dimly from the mists of the future shortly after the fateful sin of our first parents. "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed," said God to the tempter.[4] From the very outset Christ and His Mother are contrasted, in veiled terms, with the ancient Adam and Eve. The contrast is also between the two races, the fallen race and the redeemed race, mankind enslaved under the tyranny of sin and death, and the Mystical Body living the life of grace. "Duo parentes nos genuerunt ad mortem, duo parentes nos genuerunt ad vitam."[5]

Whatever the literal interpretation of the text in *Genesis* may be, Mary is the woman ultimately meant, for the seed of the woman is certainly Christ,[6] Son of Mary. And the conflict between the woman and the serpent stems from the latter's hideous success in inducing Eve to fall, so that the eventual defeat of the serpent, indicated by the crushing of his head, cannot be anything else than the annulling of the effects wrought by his crafty attack. The immediate effect of the seduction was the loss of sanctifying grace in the souls of our first ancestors and the disastrous introduction of sin, death of the soul. Accordingly, the crushing of the tempter's head must signify the destruction of his evil triumph. As sin is essentially the privation of the life of grace, the vanquishing of this privation must be a fresh production of life, in which Mary co-operates. Her function in the causing of this new, supernatural life is that of a woman doing her part for the generation of a new living being; it is a maternal function. Already in the Proto-Gospel, therefore, Mary is proclaimed, in the obscure language typical of prophecy, as the Mother of divine grace.

[4] *Gen.* 3:15.

[5] St. Augustine, *Serm.* 22, 10 (*MPL*, 38, 154).

[6] Cf. J. M. Bover, S.J., "Universalis B. Virginis mediatio," *Gregorianum*, 5 (1924), 572: "That Christ is . . . the promised seed of the woman is held by the whole Christian religion, by all the Fathers without exception, and by all theologians."

The antithesis between Eve and Mary is a favorite theme of the Fathers, who exploit the contrast to bring to light the Blessed Virgin's spiritual motherhood. St. Jerome sums up Patristic thought when he writes: "After the Virgin conceived in her womb and bore her Son for us . . . the curse was dissolved: death through Eve, life through Mary."[7] The author of a sermon formerly ascribed to St. Augustine has the same idea of Mary: "She alone deserves to be called Mother and Spouse; she repaired the damage caused by the first mother; she brought redemption to man who was lost. For the mother of our race brought down punishment on the world; but the Mother of Our Lord brought forth salvation for the world. The author of sin was Eve; the author of merit is Mary. Eve harmed us by killing us; Mary helped us by restoring life to us."[8] The spiritual nature of the Blessed Virgin's motherhood is stressed by St. Augustine in a passage that has become classical: "Mary is not the Mother, according to the spirit, of our head, the Saviour; for she is spiritually born of Him. . . . But she is truly the Mother of us, His members, because she co-operated with Christ by her charity to give birth to the faithful in the Church, who are members of the head."[9] To be our Mother, Mary must communicate life to us; and the life she communicates is sanctifying grace, true life in the supernatural order. As Mother of Christ physically, she is Mother according to grace of all who are incorporated into Christ.

When the time drew near for carrying out the promises of the Proto-Gospel, God prepared Mary for her divine and spiritual motherhood by sanctifying her in fullness. She was conceived immaculate and was perfected, to a degree never duplicated in any creature, by sanctifying grace and its accompaniment of infused virtues and gifts of the Holy Spirit. Before a woman can be a mother in the natural order, she must have attained the physical perfection that enables her to confer life on a new human being. Before Mary could be our Mother in the supernatural economy, she had to have the supernatural life of grace in such abundance that it not only perfected her individually, but equipped her to share that life with her future children. "God so prepares and en-

[7] *Epist.* 22, 21 (*MPL*, 22, 408).
[8] *Serm.* 208 (*MPL*, 39, 2130 f.).
[9] *De sancta virginitate*, 5 (*MPL*, 40, 399).

dows those whom He chooses for a particular office that they are made capable of discharging it."[10] More specifically, "God gives grace according to the purpose for which He has chosen a person. . . . The Blessed Virgin Mary received such a fullness of grace that she was nearest of all to the Author of grace, because she received within herself Him who is full of all grace; and then, by bringing Him forth, she did her part in conveying grace to all."[11] St. Thomas does not limit Mary's causality in the bestowal of grace to the indirect function of giving birth to Christ; for the Blessed Virgin "was full of grace . . . with a view to diffusing grace among all men. It is a great thing in any saint that he has grace enough to procure the salvation of many; but to have grace enough for the salvation of all men in the world, that is indeed the supreme perfection; and that is the case with Christ and the Blessed Virgin."[12] This plenitude of grace which belongs to Mary as the most exalted of God's creatures has been aptly called, by analogy with Christ's capital grace, the Blessed Virgin's "maternal grace," because it not only sanctified her incomparably beyond all other saints, but empowered her to be the Mother of grace with regard to the whole human family.[13]

Yet Mary's fullness of grace did not actually make her our spiritual Mother; it only prepared her for that office. Spiritual motherhood implies the actual production of grace in us, for motherhood consists in the communication of life. How is this verified in the relationship between the Blessed Virgin and us?

The initial phase of Mary's actual motherhood over us was inaugurated at the Incarnation when, in the little room at Nazareth, the Son of God took to Himself a human nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin. Relations between Mary and the Mystical Body are discerned even at this scene of the Annunciation; because then, as Pius XII teaches in the epilogue to his encyclical, *Mystici Corporis*,[14] "her sinless soul was filled with the divine Spirit of Jesus more than all other created souls taken together;

[10] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 27, a. 4.

[11] *Ibid.*, a. 5, ad 1.

[12] *Expositio in Ave Maria* (ed. Parm., 16, 134).

[13] Cf. M. Llamera, O.P., "La Maternidad espiritual de María," *Estudios Marianos*, 3 (1943), 153 f.; "María, madre corredentora," *Estudios Marianos*, 7 (1947), 165.

[14] *AAS*, 35 (1943), 247 f.

and 'in the name of the whole human race' she gave her consent for a 'spiritual marriage between the Son of God and human nature.' "[15] Mary gave the bridal consent to this divine marriage union as mankind's representative. By that act she made it possible for the eternal Word of God to acquire a Mystical Body from His brethren according to the flesh. As the Pope goes on to say, "within her virginal womb Christ our Lord was already crowned with the exalted title of Head of the Church." For nine months Mary was in literal truth the temple of God; and then in Bethlehem she brought forth her first-born Son: "she brought Him forth in a marvelous birth as the source of all supernatural life." By her maternity she gave to the Mystical Body its head, its source of life; the Word became incarnate to be the first-born of many brethren.

We begin to perceive Mary's place in the divine plan. She is the Mother of God. That is her matchless dignity, her proper activity. Her motherly relation to us, her causality in grace, flows from this activity. We should not unduly press the distinction between the divine maternity and the maternity of grace, necessary though it is for a correct grasp of the mystery; otherwise we may run the risk of losing sight of the concrete truth: God never thought of a Mother for His Son who is not also our Mother. The redemptive Incarnation was to be effected with the concurrence of the Mother of the Whole Christ.

Pope Pius XII proclaimed this doctrine in a broadcast to the Marian Congress held at Ottawa in 1947:

> When the little maid of Nazareth uttered her fiat to the message of the Angel and the Word was made flesh in her womb, she became not only the Mother of God in the physical order of nature, but also in the supernatural order of grace she became the Mother of all who through the Holy Spirit would be made one under the headship of her divine Son. The Mother of the Head would be the Mother of the members. The Mother of the Vine would be the Mother of the branches.[16]

That is why St. Leo the Great could say: "The birthday of the head is the birthday of the body."[17] For "Mary gave birth to

[15] St. Thomas, *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 30, a. 1.
[16] *AAS*, 39 (1947), 271.
[17] *Serm.* 26, 2 (*MPL*, 54, 213).

Christ, and in Christ she gave birth to Christians."[18] The head and the body cannot be separated; and therefore Our Lady "bore in her womb the whole mystical body, along with the physical body of Christ."[19]

Thus Mary's spiritual motherhood is a prolongation of her divine motherhood; she could not give birth to Jesus without becoming at the same time Mother of His members. We can mentally distinguish Christ the physical person and Christ the mystical person;[20] but we ought not to divide them. Jesus came on earth to be the first-born among many brethren, to incorporate them into His person and in that way make them sons of the Heavenly Father.

This furnishes us with an explanation of the Blessed Virgin's motherhood of grace. When she became Mother of Christ, head of the Mystical Body, she thereby became Mother of Christ in His members, Mother of all those who have supernatural life by being one with Christ. We cannot separate in Mary the Mother of God and the Mother of men. By consenting to be the Mother of Jesus, she consented by the same act to be the Mother of all who would be members of the Mystical Body. The Mother of the One is the Mother of all. And Mary perceived and understood all this when she replied to the angel: "Be it done to me according to thy word."

Many theologians have written essays to account for Mary's spiritual motherhood; but the words of the saintly Pius X have never been surpassed:

> Is not Mary the Mother of Christ? Then she is our Mother also. . . . As the God-man, Christ acquired a body like that of other men; but as the Saviour of our race He acquired a kind of spiritual and mystical body, which is the society of those who believe in Christ. "We, being many, are one body in Christ" (*Rom.* 12:5). . . . In one and the same womb of His most chaste Mother, Christ took to Him-

---

[18] Geoffrey of Vendôme, *Serm.* 7 (*MPL*, 157, 265).

[19] Dionysius the Carthusian, *De dignitate et laudibus B. V. M.*, 4, 16.

[20] Such is the bold language of St. Thomas: "Christ and His members are one mystical person" (*De veritate*, q. 29, a. 7, ad 11). "The head and members are as one mystic person" (*Sum. theol.* III, q. 48, a. 2, ad 1). "As the natural body is one, though made up of various members, so the whole Church, which is the mystical body of Christ, is accounted as one person with its head, which is Christ" (*ibid.*, q. 49, a. 1). "Christ and the Church are one mystical person, whose head is Christ, and the body is all the just" (*Ad Col.* lect. 1, cap. 6).

self human flesh and at the same time joined to Himself a spiritual body made up of those who were to believe in Him. Therefore Mary, bearing the Saviour in her womb, may be said to have borne also all those whose life was contained in the Saviour's life. All of us, consequently, who are united with Christ and are, as the Apostle says, "members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones" (*Eph.* 5:30), have come forth from Mary's womb as a body attached to its head. Accordingly, in a spiritual and mystical sense, we are called the children of Mary, and she is the Mother of us all.[21]

Our Lady's active co-operation in bestowing grace is indicated in a number of Gospel scenes which show that Christ, beginning to distribute grace during the time of His mortal life, willed to associate His Mother with Him. The first sanctification Jesus accomplished in this world was, according to the inspired narrative, that of John the Baptist; and this sanctification was wrought through the presence and word of Mary, on the occasion of her visit to Elizabeth. Filled with the Holy Spirit, John's mother cried out: "As soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in my ears, the infant in my womb leaped for joy."[22] This was the fulfillment of the angel's prediction about John: "He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb."[23] The passage has universally been understood by theologians as referring to a true sanctification, cleansing the Precursor's soul of original sin before his birth.[24] Some time after the nativity of Christ, Mary "presented Him, newly born, as Prophet, King, and Priest to those who were the first of the Jews and Gentiles coming to adore Him."[25] The Mother took her Child in her arms and held him out to the shepherds, and later to the Magi, for their homage. Since the first days of Christ on earth she has fostered the adoration which good men come to offer to her divine Son. She was never to be deprived of that privilege; until the end of the world she

[21] Encyclical *Ad diem illum* (*ASS*, 36 [1903-04], 452 f.).

[22] *Luke* 1:44.

[23] *Luke* 1:15. Cf. M. J. Lagrange, O.P., *Evangile selon Saint Luc*, ed. 7 (Paris: Gabalda, 1948), 42.

[24] Cf. Lagrange, *ibid.*, p. 17. St. Thomas, *Compendium of Theology* (St. Louis: Herder, 1948), chap. 224, states: "Some men . . . have been sanctified in the wombs of their mothers, in virtue of an extraordinary privilege of grace. Thus . . . the angel says of John the Baptist: 'He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb.'"

[25] Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis* (*AAS*, 35 [1943], 247).

would always instill in men a love and reverence for the Church and its head.

The Blessed Virgin's care and concern for the Mystical Body reached out to the public life of Our Lord. The miracle at Cana took place at the instigation of Mary, and the witnesses of the event gave glory to the Master and believed in Him. "Her only Son, heeding a mother's prayer in Cana of Galilee, performed the miracle by which 'His disciples believed in Him'" (*John* 2:11).[26] Her activity in the spreading of faith was clearly manifested. In thus marking her place in the first miracle worked by Christ, that which resulted in the act of faith of the apostles, God unmistakably wishes us to perceive the influence that would always be hers; the Mother of God has lost none of the power that was hers at the beginning.

On Calvary the Mystic Christ was born in pain; then it was that the Church was drawn from the side of her crucified Spouse, as Eve had been drawn from the side of Adam. "Eva de latere dormientis, Ecclesia de latere patientis."[27] The soldier pierced the heart of the executed Christ and there flowed forth blood and water, images of the Christian sacraments, of that baptism and that Eucharist which owe all their efficacy to the Passion. In that Passion Mary had her destined part: "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus His Mother."[28] But straightway the Mother of Christ became His spouse, the new Eve, spouse of the Redeemer and Mother of the redeemed. Made ready by her fullness of grace to be the Mother of grace, she then, intimately associated with her Spouse in the work of redemption, actually became the spiritual Mother of mankind. Long ago, at the angel's visit, she had consented to these mystic nuptials in the name of all human nature, and in her love she began to carry us in her heart as soon as she began to carry her Child in her womb. In this same love she brought us forth on Calvary with indescribable sufferings. The bequest of the dying Christ, "Behold thy son," had prepared her for the ultimate renouncement. "Surely she is our Mother, the Mother of compassion and grace, to whom Christ entrusted us,

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] St. Augustine, *Enarr. in Psalm.* 138, 2 (*MPL*, 37, 1785). Cf. H. Rondet, S.J., "De la place de la Très Sainte Vierge dans l'Eglise corps mystique du Christ," *Bulletin de la société française d'études mariales*, 1937, p. 210.

[28] *John* 19:25.

expiring on the cross."[29] Her co-suffering with the death of the Redeemer regenerated the world; for Mary at the foot of the cross was more than ever the representative of our race to accept pardon for us and to procure for us the life of grace. Finishing the act begun at the Annunciation, she offered the bloody sacrifice with her Son, who had so mysteriously become her Spouse. While those events were taking place on Calvary, at a time when the Christian priesthood had not yet started to function, the Blessed Virgin shared, even more than at the Incarnation, in the unique priesthood of the Redeemer.

Mary's maternal activity in the economy of grace at the hour when her Son was at the climax of His saving mission on the cross is so momentous and so stuns natural reason that the voice of the official teachers in the Church ought to be heard. Leo XIII tells us clearly: "The most holy Virgin, Mother of Jesus Christ, is also the Mother of all Christians, for she gave birth to us on Mount Calvary in the midst of the Redeemer's excruciating torments."[30] Pius XII is no less explicit: "She became our Mother when the divine Redeemer was accomplishing His sacrifice of Himself."[31] In his great encyclical, *Mystici Corporis,* the Holy Father says of Mary: "As another Eve she offered Him on Golgotha to the Eternal Father for all the children of Adam who were so wretchedly defiled by his fall, and her mother's rights and mother's love were included in the holocaust." At that decisive hour in the history of mankind Mary was not merely a private person, a mother suffering with her tortured Son, but was there officially as the new Eve. She was already the representative of her race when she became the Mother of Christ at the Annunciation; on Calvary she performed her greatest act in that capacity. By divine appointment she exercised, in accord with God's redemptive plan, a critical role in the Saviour's sacrifice on the cross: renouncing her mother's rights and giving supreme expression to her mother's love, she offered her Son to the Eternal Father. With full power of her will she united herself with Christ as the Eve of the New Testament, co-operating in the immolation of the divine Victim, the new Adam. We may not overlook the

[29] Pius VIII, Bull *Praesentissimum sane* (*Bullarium Romanum,* 18, 96).
[30] Encyclical *Quamquam pluries* (*ASS,* 22 [1889-90], 67).
[31] Encyclical *Mediator Dei* (*AAS,* 39 [1947], 582).

important fact that Pius XII draws Mary into the sacerdotal sacrifice of Jesus Christ. And the scope of her co-operation is clearly set forth: it extends as far as the sacrifice of her Son, reaching out to all the children of Adam.

The logical result of the Blessed Virgin's co-sacrifice is brought to light in the same encyclical: "Thus she, who corporally was the Mother of our Head, through the added title of suffering and glory became spiritually the Mother of all His members." Even at the moment of conceiving Christ Mary was united with the members of the Mystical Body; but on Calvary, through her bitter sufferings with Him, she acquired inviolable maternal rights over us and was charged with maternal duties toward us. She could hardly be called our Mother in a full and proper sense unless she had a causal activity in our redemption. But such activity was hers; the consequence is that we owe the eternally momentous grace of our divine sonship to the wounds and death of her Son and to her own maternal agony.

So was born the Church, holy and sanctifying, drawn from the Saviour's side. Yet, to tell the truth, we do not properly live by the Redeemer's death. This death is the life of our souls in the sense that it is its cause. By dying for us, by offering His death as the awful price of our salvation, Christ merited for us our supernatural life of grace. In the same sense Mary gave us life by giving us the Saviour's death. Supernatural life itself is the gift of divine grace and charity diffused in our souls by the Holy Spirit who comes to dwell in us: "The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost who is given to us."[32] Dwelling thus in us, the Holy Spirit divinely and supernaturally vivifies our souls. Each person actually possesses this life through the application to him of the merits of Christ's death; and this application is made in the unfolding of time, by the means established and left by the Saviour to the Church. And so on the fiftieth day after the Resurrection, the tenth day after the Ascension, on the day of Pentecost, when the hearts of the disciples had been well prepared by prayer and contemplation in the Cenacle, the heavens were opened to let down the Holy Spirit, and the fruit of the sacrifice offered by the Redeemer and His Mother on Calvary was given in fullness, and thereafter would continue to be given for all time.

[32] *Rom.* 5:5.

The Mother of God had a function to perform in this application. She had surrendered up for us Him who is the cause and source of our spiritual life. But beyond that, she had part in the actual bestowal of the Holy Spirit which completes the redemption; for it was her prayers that opened heaven for the descent of the Giver of Life. That and no less is what Pius XII, summing up the mind of Tradition, tells us: "She it was who by her powerful prayers obtained the grace that the Spirit of our divine Redeemer, already conferred on the cross, should be given through miraculous gifts to the newly founded Church on Pentecost." The apostles closed ranks around their dear Mother, united in a common spirit of recollection and love. In response to the ardent pleas of Mary, the enlivening Spirit hovered over those timorous men and transformed them into an intrepid and valiant army which at once launched the attack that was to conquer the world.

Until the risen Christ had ascended into heaven, the Church was not clearly perceptible to the eyes of men. But beginning with the day of Pentecost all that was changed. Little by little the Church disclosed itself as an institution of salvation, little by little it emerged in its visible form of a social organism that lived and gave life, that gathered men together from all lands and incorporated them into itself.

The chief activity responsible for the growth of the primitive Church is that of God, and is ascribed by appropriation to the Holy Spirit. "The Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, He will teach you all things and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you."[33] But to organize the Church, the apostles had to draw on their own resources. They had to pray, reflect, and consult with one another. They had to assemble their memories, revive the years passed in the company of Jesus, reproduce faithfully His doctrinal instructions and moral teachings. The light of the Holy Spirit was in them; but that light supposed human experience and knowledge which it would illuminate with new brilliance. In this work Mary was with them. She had received the Holy Spirit in fullness, and was therefore able to counsel, advise, remind them. Tradition assures us with many testimonies that the Blessed Virgin had such an office. Eadmer's voice is one of the clearest:

[33] *John* 14:26.

Her stay on earth among the apostles after the Lord's ascension was useful and even necessary for our faith. Although they were taught all truth by the revelation of the Holy Spirit, she, enlightened by the same Spirit, understood the depth of this truth incomparably more perfectly and clearly, and therefore many things were made known to them by her, for she had learned about the mysteries of our Lord Jesus Christ not only by way of simple knowledge, but by way of personal experience.[34]

Eight centuries later Leo XIII echoes the same thought: After the ascension of her Son, the Blessed Virgin, "although worthy of heaven, was detained on earth to be the most excellent consoler and teacher of the newborn Church, for she had penetrated into the abyss of divine wisdom more deeply than anyone could have thought."[35]

Mary did not, of course, preside at the assemblies of the apostles, as though she had been invested with an authority superior to theirs. Peter, visible head of the visible Church, alone had the primacy over the young society. But in the taxing labor of organizing the Church conformably to the Master's intentions, Peter and his companions had to go over all they had learned from Christ and about Christ in the few years they had spent with Him. In this enterprise the Blessed Virgin was able to open up to them the treasures of a vastly richer experience that had lasted over thirty years. The Mother never forgot a detail of that marvelous period. "Mary kept all these words, pondering them in her heart."[36] The lowly routine as well as the striking events of that blessed life were her own treasure; but that treasure she turned over to the Church.

Thus Mary remained on earth after the Ascension; not for her own sake, surely, but for the sake of the Mystical Body. As in former days she had watched over the crib of Jesus, she later watched over the cradle of the nascent Church. The Church was teeming with the life and power that guaranteed its eventual triumph; but its members were still weak and its organization was rudimentary. It was a delicate organism, like a newborn infant.

[34] *De excellentia Virginis Mariae*, 7 (*MPL*, 159, 571). This work is really a sermon by St. Anselm; cf. *DTC*, 4, 1977.

[35] Encyclical, *Iucunda semper* (*ASS*, 27 [1894-95], 179).

[36] *Luke* 2:19.

The dangers menacing its first steps were terrifying; the mystical Christ had to grow up in a hostile environment, bristling with hatred, ill-will, and murderous persecutions. But the Mother who had guided the infancy of her Child also lavished her maternal care on the infancy of the Mystic Christ during those first anxious years.

God's plans do not change. Mary still continues in heaven to exercise her maternal activity in all the graces that come to us from God.

> Raised up into heaven near her Son, she immediately began to watch over the Church, to assist and guard us as a Mother. It was God's design that, after having served as intermediary in the accomplishment of the mystery of the Redemption, she should likewise be the intermediary of the grace which would flow forth from that mystery in all times, endowed for this purpose with a power almost without limit.[37]

Our birth to the life of grace and our supernatural growth require the continued action of the Mother who bears us and who bears Christ in us. And that is the way the Catholic populace understands Mary's spiritual motherhood: it was not only a past act whose effects continue to be operative in us, but is a present and unceasing intervention in our birth to grace and our faltering progress toward heaven, in the gradual forming of Jesus Christ in us.

CYRIL VOLLERT, S.J.

St. Mary's College
St. Mary's, Kansas

[37] Leo XIII, Encyclical *Adiutricem populi* (*ASS*, 28 [1895-96], 130).

THE VERY REVEREND WALTER FARRELL, O.P., S.T.M.

It was mid-June of 1933, and our class had just arrived at the venerable Priory of Saint Joseph, Perry County, Ohio, the second oldest Dominican establishment in the United States. We had just finished our three year course in philosophy at the Dominican House of Studies, River Forest, Illinois. There was amongst us a tendency to relax. Compared to the huge House of Studies, old Saint Joseph's was a homey place. Then, too, our class was by itself for the first time in three years; it was summer; there was no class—and the prior was away. The youth of the sub-prior, who didn't look any older than the youngest man in our class and his twinkling eyes led us, or me anyway, to believe that under the circumstances he wouldn't be too insistent upon strict religious discipline. I soon found out that it didn't take the twinkle long to become a glitter. I was acting the fool a bit, just a little bit, at table when one of the waiters brought me a message, "Father Farrell says that he doesn't want to call you down in public unless he has to; but he says that he will tolerate no nonsense. *Verbum sat sapienti.*" That was my first meeting with Fr. Walter Farrell.

Notwithstanding the fact that he was a strict disciplinarian, there was not a man in our class who was not sorry to learn in September that Fr. Farrell would not teach us at Saint Joseph's for he had been assigned to the House of Studies in Washington. In the two months he had been with us we had learned to admire as well as respect Walter Farrell. He had accompanied us on our walks; had joined in our recreations; and, most important of all, had played on our ball team. Our class took considerable pride in our team. Over the years from the time we had come together in the simple novitiate we had compiled a pretty fair record. But our shortstop, one of the best hitters on the team, had left at River Forest before taking solemn vows, and we had heard that the teams in Perry County were tough. It appeared that we had a bad summer ahead of us. However, the hole at short was effectively plugged. Fr. Farrell took over the position and played it as though he had been born at short. It wasn't until much later that I found out he hadn't been a shortstop all his life. He

was really a catcher, and it was as a catcher that the Chicago White Sox had offered him a contract the year he entered the novitiate.

That was back in 1920 when Raphael Anthony Farrell was eighteen, a student at Quigley Prep, and a bright star of the Chicago sandlots. But Raphael Farrell had turned down the White Sox' offer and had entered the Order of Preachers at this same Saint Joseph's (which was at that time the simple novitiate), taking the name in religion of Brother Walter. He had gone through the usual Dominican courses of study and had been ordained at Saint Dominic's Church, Washington, D. C., June 9, 1927, by Archbishop Michael J. Curley of Baltimore.

Young Fr. Farrell had proved himself a brilliant student of philosophy and theology, so upon the completion of the ordinary course in 1928 he was awarded the Dominican degree of Lector of Sacred Theology and sent to the University of Fribourg (Switzerland) to study for the doctorate. He completed the course *magna cum laude* in 1930 and the thesis which he submitted for the degree was rated *summa cum laude*. It was in this thesis, *The Natural Moral Law According to St. Thomas and Suarez*, that Fr. Farrell first showed signs of exceptional ability to interpret the teaching of Saint Thomas into forceful modern English. That was the point that most reviewers of the work stressed. In the *Colombia Review* (University of Fribourg), March, 1931, F.X.S. is enthusiastic: "This able exposition of the Moral Law according to the Masters of the Dominican and Jesuit Schools won for its author the highest honors at our University. It is written in a very pleasing style and [is] remarkably thorough and clear throughout."

This was the general tenor of the reviews; and although some few found fault, principally upon technical grounds (it was an abominable piece of printing and proofreading), most of the reviewers, while not as enthusiastic as F.X.S., agreed in substance with what the late Doctor John Montgomery Cooper of Catholic University wrote in a letter to Father Farrell: "This is by far the clearest and most satisfactory statement of the problem I have anywhere seen. My most cordial congratulations to you for blazing the way and serving as our guide through this labyrinth." This was, indeed, unusually high praise for a dissertation; but this was, indeed, an unusual dissertation.

Upon his return to the United States in 1930, Fr. Farrell was assigned to Saint Joseph's Priory to teach theology. His activities for the next five years were limited strictly to teaching and studying the doctrine of Saint Thomas Aquinas. He delved into the *Opera omnia* of the Angel of the Schools and, in the words of a later critic of his writing, saturated himself in the thought of the holy doctor. It was my privilege during three of those years of Fr. Farrell's early teaching career (1934-37) to have had him as professor. During those years he lectured at the House of Studies on the Second Part of the *Summa*. He was not the most brilliant lecturer our class had heard (I think that most of us would grant that distinction to the late Fr. John J. Welsh, O.P.) but we never had one with a quicker or more penetrating mind, or a more thorough knowledge of the *Summa*. He was a quietly nervous lecturer. He did not pace the floor as some nervous professors do. No, indeed. He planted his slim six foot frame into the chair behind his desk, but his eyes paced the floor. His twinkling black eyes darted all over the class, sure to pounce upon the first unfortunate who showed the slightest sign of inattention. He detested a limp class that showed no aptitude for argumentation; but he had no patience with argumentation that was mere obscurantism; or argument for the sake of argument. He detested stupidity and obstinacy especially in combination, and would, in his early days, treat such conduct unmercifully. He had a tongue like a whiplash. But with the passing of years and greater progress in virtue, this naturally impatient man developed a surpassing patience, great kindness, and tolerance. It was a great victory of grace over nature.

I have said that Walter Farrell was not our most brilliant lecturer, and that is true; but it was not because he lacked either the mentality or knowledge of Saint Thomas; it was because he had little natural aptitude for either pulpit or platform. This may seem a surprising statement about a man who later became well known both as preacher and lecturer, but it is none the less true. I don't believe that Demosthenes himself ever worked harder to overcome natural handicaps to public speaking. Walter Farrell did not stutter like Demosthenes but he had the no less severe handicap of shyness. He was painfully shy. It might be better to say that he was humble rather than shy because most of his shyness came from the conviction that he himself presented an ungainly

figure. How he ever became convinced of this is hard to say because it was absolutely false. He was about six feet in height and very slim, never at any time that I knew him weighing over 150 pounds. He had the grace of a natural athlete, and an attractive, not to say handsome, face, with a most remarkable pair of twinkling black (at least they looked black although his passports called them brown) eyes. In Walter Farrell the eyes were the man. They were truly windows of the soul, for in their good natured sparkle you glimpsed the good nature and brilliance of the great soul and mind behind them. In public, even just walking along the street, he cocked his head at a peculiar angle like a truculent rooster. And it was traditional in the studium that Fr. Farrell had a soft spot in his heart for students who were tall and skinny or otherwise ungainly. They were sure to get the breaks in the oral exams. Those who were of a normal physical structure had to earn every bean they got.

It was in 1935 that Walter Farrell first started to come out of his shell like a butterfly emerging from its cocoon. That year, under the auspices of the Catholic Thought Association and upon the recommendation of Fr. Ignatius Smith, O.P., he continued the lectures which had been inaugurated by Fr. Smith the previous year. *The Catholic News* of New York for Nov. 23, 1935, reported:

> Friday night, Nov. 15, at the Center Club the second season opened for the Catholic Thought Association. Father Walter Farrell, O.P. . . . gave the opening lecture in a proposed four year course in the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas. . . . His first lecture on the *Summa* as a book was eloquent. The interest and delight of the audience gave promise of a fruitful season in this series of lectures. Father Farrell's simplicity and sincerity of manner, his keen analysis of his matter and his sense of humor won the respect and admiration of his audience.

It was from these lectures that the four volume *Companion to the Summa* grew. Encouraged by the reception given to the lectures by the public, Sheed and Ward took a chance on publishing a first trial volume. Counting upon its greater popular appeal they chose to publish the moral theology first. And so *The Pursuit of Happiness*, the second volume of the series, appeared in the fall of 1938. It proved to be a great success and one of the biggest surprises the publishing game had received in years. Critical

notices, especially those written by priests and theologians, were all of the "rave" variety. Probably no work on theology published in the United States ever received such universal acclaim. A few quotes will serve to show its impact upon the Catholic world:

The Sign: "He has taken the nuggets of pure gold which lie in the *Summa* and fashioned them into delightful shapes which attract the ordinary man. . . . The author is so saturated with the teaching of the Angelic Doctor that he can show it forth with grace and ease without sacrificing the truth, as a man with a strong and flexible voice can adapt it to convey every shade of feeling without strain."

Newletter, Catholic Book Club (November, 1938): "Dr. Farrell might well have made his own the words of a great contemporary English thinker who, in a similar case declared, 'I have therefore been impelled . . . to leave the templa serena of divine philosophy, in order to take part in the turmoil of the street and the market place.'"

The Preservation of the Faith: "The Pursuit of Happiness by Dr. Farrell is like a glass of clear sparkling wine after a long and weary drought."

The Clergy Review (English): "Originally composed as a series of lectures delivered in New York, these chapters are in effect a masterly presentation, in popular but accurate language of the whole of the ethical doctrine of Saint Thomas."

The Modern Schoolman: "Here for the first time in an American author, the thought of St. Thomas meets us in a brisk, witty style that has too long been the prerogative of so-called 'modern philosophers.'"

Homiletic and Pastoral Review: "His work is masterful. He has grasped and digested the thought and implication of St. Thomas in all their sublimity and depth and breadth."

This is but a random skimming of the spate of enthusiastic reviews that came from all over the Catholic world. It was a powerful encouragement to Sheed and Ward and to Fr. Farrell to continue the project. The four-volume series was finished in the spring of 1943 and won for Fr. Farrell in 1942 the award of the Gallery of Living Catholic Authors.

In the meantime a distinction of much more value in Fr. Farrell's eyes than any literary award had been accorded him when, in 1939, the Holy See, at the petition of the Most Reverend Martin S. Gillet, Master General of the Order of Preachers, granted him the Dominican degree of Master of Sacred Theology. In June of the same year he became Regent of Studies of the Dominican Province of St. Joseph, a position he had filled in fact, if not in full title, since the previous year.

Early in 1943 Fr. Farrell took a step that amazed most of those who knew him, particularly those who knew of the precarious state of his health and had witnessed his constant suffering. Against the advice of physicians he applied for admission into the Chaplain Corps of the United States Navy. The examining physicians of the Navy promptly turned him down. It was rumored at the time, although I have never heard Fr. Farrell either confirm or deny it, that he was admitted to the Navy because of pressure from the White House. Whether or not F.D.R. intervened, at all events Walter Farrell at the age of forty-one took up an entirely new career. With only two or three months of parish experience in his entire priestly life, he took on a job that was parochial in essence. He became Lieutenant R. A. W. Farrell, U.S.N.R., and according to all reports an exceptional chaplain.

Lt. Cdr. William F. Wallace (now Brother Augustine, O.P., a student for the priesthood), who served with Chaplain Farrell on the *Yorktown*, the famous "Fighting Lady," regards him as the most capable chaplain he met in the service, and Wallace, who was an ordnance expert was attached to many units of the war-time Navy, met a number of chaplains. He never met one, he says, who was so respected by the officers of all faiths (including the other chaplains), and who had such great influence with the men. Chaplain Farrell believed that religion was the most important element in the lives of the men and therefore the most important thing in the life of a ship. The men on the "Fighting Lady" had more religious services than the congregation of many a church. Mass was celebrated and the rosary recited daily. All seasonal devotions, such as the devotions to Our Blessed Mother during May, and the devotions to the Sacred Heart in June, were observed, with the recitation of the rosary, the litanies, and the giving of benediction. Fr. Farrell attributed the fact that

the *Yorktown* had never been hit by enemy fire to the custom he maintained of making it a floating church by keeping the Blessed Sacrament reserved in his quarters. (There was no other place it could be safely kept.)

Now, it is customary to think of theologians as cold men, "all brain and no heart," who, because of their scientific slant of mind are unable to preach rousing sermons. And this opinion persists among priests despite the fact that the greatest preachers the Church has produced were also great theologians. Saint Thomas, for example, could and did stir congregations to tears. And this was true, too, of Walter Farrell. According to Brother Augustine, Fr. Farrell's sermons were the most striking he has ever heard. He had a "genius for raising his hearers to the most sublime heights from as common a starting point as last night's movie." And this appeal as a preacher was not only to officers like Wallace whose educational background might make them more appreciative of a "higher type" of preaching. If anything, Brother Augustine assures me, Fr. Farrell's sermons met with greater appreciation among the enlisted men.

His influence with the men is well illustrated by the following incident which, incidentally, did not take place on the *Yorktown:* The enlisted men had been called to assembly one day and harangued at great length by an officer on the necessity of using the proper precautions against contracting V.D., the proper precautions being approved sanitary measures. The officer emphasized the fact that the Navy was not asking the impossible of the men; they were not expected to abstain. But they should take the proper precautions as a matter of duty to their country, their shipmates, and themselves. When the officer had finished Chaplain Farrell took the floor. He pointed out to the men that if they were brute beasts the advice given by the officer would be excellent, because the brute has no freedom of will. He knows only stimuli and compulsion. But man, Fr. Farrell pointed out, has free will. That was the gist of his talk. It is a fundamental truth of theology, so fundamental and oft preached that its statement sometimes causes yawns here and there in an audience. Whether it was the manner in which it was delivered or the language in which it was couched, I do not know, but Fr. Farrell stated that truth, in his short talk, in such a way as to bring the men to their feet cheering.

Upon his discharge from the Navy, Fr. Farrell returned to his old post at the Dominican House of Studies in Washington, where he took up once again the duties of Regent of Studies (he had never been permitted to resign the office). A considerable task faced him, for in these days of total conflict when they take chaplains even from the Trappists, war can disrupt the faculty and the *ratio studiorum* of a religious order. The returning Regent, weakened in health, was faced with the task of complete reorganization. But weak health had never before stood in Walter Farrell's way; nor did it this time. He finished his work before he collapsed at his post. In the fall of 1947 he underwent the first of a series of lung operations at Georgetown University Hospital. The operations were successful. Fr. Farrell, his work in Saint Joseph's Province finished, went to the Province of Saint Albert the Great, the mid-west Dominican province, which he had joined in 1940 shortly after its foundation. There he started to fight his way back to health. It was a long slow battle, but it was apparently successful. He was beginning to get back to his work of giving retreats and lecturing. He was supposed to take up light teaching duties very soon. Then God, who mayhap was looking for another companion for Saint Thomas, picked Walter Farrell for the post.

Fr. Farrell was about the best religious I have ever known. As a Dominican he approached the ideal. If it be true that the foundation stone of sanctity is humility, then his religious life was well grounded. Pages could be written about his sanctity and possibly some day pages will be written on it for the process of canonization. But I believe that I will let Walter Farrell himself, in his own epigrammatic way, unwittingly give us an insight into that sanctity. Once when he was preparing to give a retreat to the clergy of a certain diocese, he was telling me how much he dreaded the task. Here was one of the country's best theologians, an acknowledged master of the spiritual life, and a highly successful preacher of retreats who doubted his ability to instruct his fellow priests. "You know, Reggie," he said to me, "It's like being sent to teach the Yankees how to bat. There won't be a man there who couldn't teach me."

REGINALD M. COFFEY, O.P.

Washington, D. C.
Dominican House of Studies

A QUEST OF THOUGHTS

PART IV

THE SAINT AS REALIST

A man is normal and happy, at least to a degree, when he is adjusted to his environment and when he has achieved an internal balance. The saint is the most normal of men. Most of all men, he is at peace within himself and is adjusted to his environment. The saint accepts his surroundings completely. The more evil those surroundings are, the more he accepts them. He can do this because he sees his environment in its true character. He is a realist: he sees men for what they are and also for what they should be. Hence he can accept them in the most complete manner. He does not make the mistake of trying to escape from his fellow men, nor does he join himself to them in their evil. He accepts sinners for what they really are and for what they even more really should be. The more sinful they are the more readily, the more fully does the saint accept them and the more fully does he strive to make them what they should be. Hence he serves them, lifts them up, and even dies for them. Thus Father Damien on Molokai and St. Peter Claver among the slaves at Cartagena. But the act by which the saint accepts others is one in which he gives himself to those others. The saints are the happiest of men and women because they give up all things, and themselves too, to God and their fellow men.

TWO MINOR CATEGORIES

In some of his lists of the categories Aristotle includes the two minor accidents of *situs*, or posture, and *habitus*. These do not seem to be on the same level as quantity and quality, relation, action and passion, and the rest. At first sight they seem to be almost trivial.

Reflection shows that they are not trivial or unimportant. The best instance of substance that we have at hand is man himself. Moreover, this complete substance which each of us is can have its full being only when all its accidents are listed. We see that *situs* and *habitus* are peculiarly human and therefore especially high, accidents.

It is because I am a man, a rational animal, that I kneel in

prayer, stand at attention, and sit in judgment. Lower animals, lesser substances, cannot do this.

It is because I am a man that "I am clothed" and that I am equipped with tools, whether to conquer nature, feed myself, or wage war. Man, the rational animal, fulfills and extends his rational nature by clothing himself, not only to cover his nakedness and give himself warmth but also to adorn himself. He makes his tools, and even adorns them, and he cherishes them both for their utility and for their beauty.

Moreover, to give up clothing and tools is to revert to savagery and to lower ourselves below the beasts.

How true this is is seen at the Crucifixion. As Eric Gill points out in his Stations of the Cross, the fact that Jesus was stripped of His garments was part of His passion in a very definite way. The Romans stripped the man they were about to crucify because they wished to strip him of his human dignity and degrade him. They wished to deprive him of all status and all evidence of the freedom of will which marks man off from the beast. They wished also to prevent him from exercising his reason and to keep him from dying as a rational being, clothed and protected in this most elementary way. The depth of Aristotle's insight is confirmed by the Crucifixion itself.

CAN AND OUGHT

It is instructive to note variations on the same theme in the writings of men in different times and places. A case in point is found in a thought that is expressed in the Pythagorean Golden Words, which belong to the third century B.C.: "For Can dwells ever nigh to Must."

Schiller—not Immanuel Kant, as is often thought, although Kant expresses the same idea in his *Religion within the Limits of Pure Reason*—gives this its most famous expression: "Du sollst, denn der kannst." Here we have the argument for free will drawn from moral obligation in its most succinct expression.

In the last lines of "Voluntaries," written in memory of Col. Robert Gould Shaw, Emerson uses the same thought, although not as effectively,

> So close is grandeur to our dust,
> So nigh is God to man.
> When Duty whispers low, Thou must,
> The youth replies, I can.

A. E. Housman, with his affectation of Stoicism, writes thus in *Last Poems*

> The troubles of our proud and angry dust
> Are from eternity and shall not fail.
> Bear them we can, and if we can we must.
> Shoulder the shy, my lad, and drink your ale.

There is another aspect of the matter. The fact that we must do certain things is proof that we can do them. At the same time, there is a natural rebellion on our part at doing our duty. What I ought to do is what I do not want to do. Dante Gabriel Rossetti wrote: "As soon as a thing is imposed on me as an obligation, my aptitude for doing it is gone; what I *ought* to do is what I *can't* do!"

Even when there is good will there is failure. "For the good which I will, I do not, but the evil which I will not that I do," said St. Paul and Juvenal has something of the same sort.

ANOTHER PARADOX

Rossetti's remark illustrates what may be called the Stoic paradox, the parallel of the hedonistic paradox. The hedonistic doctrine that pleasure alone is good and pain alone is evil is refuted by the fact that we cannot successfully seek pleasure as a good. The supposed end and good eludes us when it is sought as such; hence it cannot be a true end.

Similarly, Kantian Stoic formalism is refuted by the fact that slavery to duty takes the joy out of doing one's duty. Again, the best instances of good men are concerned with something more than duty.

COMMAND AND PRECEPT

In Boswell's *Life of Johnson* there is a report of a conversation between Johnson, Boswell, and Goldsmith that took place in 1766, when Johnson was fifty-seven years old. Johnson denied that he had a duty of writing further. "No, Sir, I am not obliged to do any more. No man is obliged to do as much as he can do. A man is to have part of his life to himself. If a soldier has fought a good many campaigns, he is not to be blamed if he retires to ease and tranquillity. A physician, who has practiced long in a great city, may be excused if he retires to a small town and takes less practice."

This is good moral theory. A man is morally bound to do his duty, but his duty—what he ought to do—does not include what-

ever he can do. That is where certain Kantians, if not Kant himself, erred. Thus Paul Janet held that St. Vincent de Paul had a strict duty of doing all that he did. If the tremendous deeds that we know of were what Vincent de Paul could do, as they evidently were, that was what he had a duty of doing.

The difference between the saint and the good man (like Dr. Johnson) lies in this: both saint and good man do their duty, but the saint does more. The saint and the good man fulfill the commandments, but the saint fulfills the precepts as well. St. Vincent de Paul is a saint because he does as much as he can do. He does so not because it is his duty, but because it is over and above the demands of duty.

Omne verum vero consonat is a true maxim. Consistency is an effect of truth and an indication of its presence.

We may also say: *Omne falsum falso consonat.* Apparently contradictory errors upon analysis amount to one and the same thing. Thus Stoicism and Epicureanism show themselves to be much the same, especially in practice. What *real* difference is there between atheism with its assertion that there is no God, and pantheism, with its assertion that there is nothing but God. So also Protestantism begins with the dogma that man is justified by faith alone and ends with the dogma that religion consists of nothing but good deeds.

PLATO'S TRUE LIE

When talking about lies in the *Republic* Plato says that ordinary lies are, as it were, imitations and not the real thing. When a man tells a lie, at least he knows what the truth is, for if he did not he could not falsify his speech.

But "the true lie," says Plato, is something worse than this. It is ignorance in the soul about the best and highest things. This is the worst and most disastrous sort of error and deception. If I do not know what I ought to know, and what I ought to be, and what I ought to do, then indeed am I in ignorance. If I do not know what is truth, honor, justice, love, faith, and hope, then there is ignorance and error in the highest part of me concerning the highest things. If I do not know that there is a soul, freedom of will, moral responsibility, heaven and hell, and God, a just judge, then my mind is beset with error. If I do not know who Jesus Christ is and what His Church is, then I am in ignorance and error about the highest things.

These are the true lies, the most complete and the most pernicious denials of the truth. The minds of men are today filled with such lies and by them is the world made hideous.

WORLD REVOLUTION

The Russian Revolution had been foretold so often over a long course of years that when it came in 1917 many people did not recognize it.

So it is with world revolution and the work of a small group to dominate in every nation. We have read so many stories telling of the plots of sinister men to capture the entire world that we cannot convince ourselves that the plot is actually being executed today.

Yet from Moscow the plot is being directed. Its agents are working in Mexico, Cuba, Guatemala, Colombia, and other South American countries. America has the greatest Fifth Column in all history. Russia dominates Eastern Europe and a great part of Asia. It will strive to dominate Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, and the rest of Europe. Only the Church is in its way.

Yet over a long period of years Americans and others had no more concern for this actual plan to seize the world than they had for a plot of Dr. Fu Manchu's or Prof. Moriarity's.

AMERICA THE WARLIKE

We like to think of ourselves as a peaceful and peace-loving nation. We contrast America to Europe. We see that while Europe's history has been one of militarism with all its sorrows and disasters, ours has been one of peace and prosperity. We have not been a warlike nation, but we have not been mere pacifists. We have been peace-loving, yet brave and independent, jealous of our rights, liberties, and possessions and ready to defend them.

Does the record confirm these beliefs? Our nation was born out of a long war. Less than thirty years after winning this war for independence we were again battling England. In the war of 1812 all the laurels did not fall to us. We had passages at arms with France and Tripoli. The West was won in large part by the force of arms. When we wanted the southwest we wrested it in battle from Mexico. From Spain we took Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. From Colombia the republic of Panama was cut off by disreputable means that were power politics at their crudest.

Time and time again our troops have been in action on Latin American soil.

Worst of all for our record as a peaceful nation is the story of the years 1861-65, together with the events that led up to them and those that followed them. A republic, extending over a continent, its dominant classes in agreement in language, race, and religion, plunged heedlessly and needlessly into exhausting strife. Has any European nation anything in its history quite the same as the war between the states?

When a general European war broke out in 1914, we would not stand aloof. Just as we had intervened in the general European war of a century before, so powerful groups were determined that we should intervene again. No one who was young in 1917 and 1918 can forget the exaltation of those days when we waged war to end war. Then we set out on a crusade to make the world safe for democracy, with "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" and "Over There" on our lips.

But the war did not end on Nov. 11, 1918. That day was only the first in a long armistice. When the armistice ceased even in name in September, 1939, the issue of war was again before us and the opposition of such groups as "America First" only emphasized our belligerent status. Long before Pearl Harbor we were actively at war as the arsenal of democracy. After Pearl Harbor we waged total war upon a scale and with a success undreamed of in history. For by our prodigious efforts at home, upon land and sea, and in the air we saved Britain and Russia, liberated France, Italy, and other nations, and laid the Axis low. Nothing in the history of warfare can compare with what we did between December, 1941, and August, 1945.

We hate war and we love peace. Yet we have a history of going to war every twenty or thirty years. Is our hatred of war as deep and as real as we think it to be?

THE GOOD AND THE BAD

With the development of the novel and its unending multiplication, the notion has taken hold that good people are dull and uninteresting and the wicked clever, interesting, and even fascinating. The pages of modern novels are filled with daring hussies, lustful young heroes, and lecherous and sinister villains, who shine in

contrast to namby-pamby good young girls and priggish good young men.

In many ways it is a mark of literary incompetence for a writer to make his good characters dull and his bad goods attractive. It is the easy thing to do. Dickens is not supremely great as a writer, and one of the various indications of this is the fact that his good girls are so ineffective. Their lack of appeal is a sign of a defect in his genius. *Vanity Fair* is a great work but it would have been greater still if Thackeray had the power to make Amelia Sedley as strong and colorful as Becky Sharp.

On the other hand, it is a part of Shakespeare's greatness that he could produce such a gallery of pure women faithfully presented as are found in his plays. Portia, Desdemona, and Cordelia are each of them "a good woman," noble, strong, attractive, and impressive. Yet each of them is as different from the others as is Iago from Macbeth or Hamlet from Othello. Because he was so great, Shakespeare saw the variety of good men and women and could put that greatness upon the stage and within the covers of a book.

A GREEK MAXIM

The Greeks said that a man could be evil in many ways but good in only one way.

They were thinking, on the one hand, of the identity of goodness and unity, and on the other of the variety of wrongdoing.

If a man is to be good, he must be completely good. There must be unity in his life and integrity in his character. If he approves the good and follows the bad, we can hardly say that he is good. If he has prudence, temperance, and fortitude, but lacks justice, he is not a good man. To be really good a man must be completely good.

Yet a man need not be completely evil, rejecting all the virtues and crying out with Lucifer, "Evil, be thou my good!" The evil-doer can take his choice, as it were. He can be intemperate without being cruel, unjust without being unchaste, a lecherer without being a coward.

Indeed the variety of evil is so great, that a man cannot be too greedy if he aspires to greatness in evil. A man who gives himself over to the vice of avarice has to deny himself many things to build and keep his fortune. If a man is to be a tyrant, it is best for him

to be abstemious. No small part of Mussolini's failure, even as a tyrant, lay in his lust. The thief or murderer who falls victim to the vice of vanity and boasts of his exploits will not be long successful. A man can be evil in many ways, but not in too many ways. For most men, one vice is about all our weak and fallen nature can stand.

THE MONOTONY OF VILLAINY

There are many ways of going to perdition, and many ways of being a villain. Yet the ways of villainy are not unlimited, and there is a lack of variety upon each of the ways to hell.

A man gives himself over to greed and his life becomes a monotonous repetition of schemes and deeds of acquisition. There may be variety in these schemes and deeds, but the end is always the same. There can be little thrill in the repeated grasping of gains. The gains themselves become commonplace and lose their fascination, and the man who sets his heart on mere gain becomes a dull fellow.

There is the same monotony for the debauched man and woman in their deeds. There is the same dull repetition in the acts of the cruel and vindictive man. Hence each of them, the debaucher, the sadist, and the hateful man, tries to find some variety in his sin and some new method that will give him back the old original thrill or a new one in its place.

There can be no real addition to the various species of human sins. Only in the sin of wanton, sadistic cruelty, in man's inhumanity to man, does there seem to be any unending possibility of variety and development. The German prison camps are an instance. Yet even here what is new is not so much the forms that cruelty took as its extent. What novelty there is is found in the fact that the Germans did what others have speculated upon, as in the case of experiments performed on living men and women.

But the repetition of sins only serves to debase and destroy. The more evil a man does, the less "personality" he has, the duller and less attractive, the more empty and the more repulsive he becomes. Don Juan in his youth is full of fire and color, but the old man, the Don Juan who has repeated his role over and over, is not a pretty figure. And one Don Juan is much the same as another. There is little difference between thieves as thieves, or between murderers as murderers, or between liars as liars, or between cowards as

cowards. After all, then, there are not so many ways of being evil and those ways lead to sameness, to dullness, to worthlessness, and emptiness.

WHOLENESS

The natural man is a philosopher and his desire for a knowledge of causes and for a comprehensive view of things shows itself in practices as well as in theory. We are dissatisfied at doing what we do not understand. We rebel at doing things that have no purpose. We grow discontented and uninterested if we cannot perceive the purpose of our work, or if we do not see the complete pattern. To put prisoners on a treadmill, as they did in the nineteenth century, is almost as severe a punishment as to put them in solitary confinement. The most boring work I ever did was during a summer spent in a railroad office transferring meaningless figures from one ledger to another.

Not only do we become uninterested in our work if we do not see its nature and purpose, but we become uninteresting. The man who simply repeats over and over the same little operation never acquires a command over the whole process and never has the satisfaction of producing and seeing the completed whole. In doing his little part over and over again he becomes a mere part himself, a wheel in a greater machine. The more he becomes such, the less does he remain a man. For each man is an end in himself and must never be treated by other men as a mere means to be used by them and for their ends. Still less must any man be a mere means to the good or to the functioning of a machine or of a system.

Here lies one of the great dangers of modern life. We are increasingly faced with this *dehonestamentum humani generis,* with this degradation of mankind and of individual men to the level of means to an end. Not the state, not society, not industry, and not the national economy is the good and the end. Man, or better, individual living men, women, and children, is the end for which the state and industry and the rest exist. It is the great task before us to produce a state, an economy, and a social system in which men and women will again see the purpose of themselves and of material things. Thus seeing the purpose of life they again will be able to see it steady and to see it whole.

JOHN K. RYAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

EASTER EVE

Part II

The decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites restoring the solemn Easter Vigil, quoted in its entirety in the first installment on this subject, states that the matter had been given over to a special commission of experts in this field. Thus we are most grateful to the Holy Father, not only for the restoration of the Easter liturgy to the more suitable night hour, but also for the very successful revised rite issuing from the scholarly efforts of the experts. It is apparent at first glance that, combined with an understanding of history, these experts were endowed with a real feeling for the liturgy.

THE NEW RITE

I. *The Divine Office:*

(1) Matins and Lauds of Holy Saturday are not anticipated the night before, but are said at a suitable hour in the morning, as given in the Roman breviary. However, there is one change: after the *Christus factus est* of Lauds, the psalm *Miserére* is omitted, and the following prayer is added directly:

Concéde, quaésumus, omnípotens Deus: ut qui Fílii tui resurrectiónem devóta exspectatióne praevenímus; eiúsdem resurrectiónis glóriam consequámur. *Et sub silentio concluditur:* Per eúndem Dóminum.

(2) The Little Hours are said at the proper time, the same as on Maundy Thursday, but following the psalms with their antiphon *Christus factus est,* the *Miserére* is omitted, and the prayer given above for Lauds is added immediately.

(3) Vespers is said at a suitable time after midday, as given in the breviary for Maundy Thursday, except for what follows:

Antiphon I: Hódie afflictus sum valde, sed cras solvam víncula méa. *Antiphon for the Magnificat:* Príncipes sacerdótum et pharisaéi muniérunt sepúlcrum, signántes lápidem, cum custódibus.

This antiphon is repeated at the end of the Magnificat. The antiphon *Christus factus est* and the *Miserére* are omitted. The prayer given above for Lauds concludes the hour of Vespers.

(4) Compline is said at the proper time, the same as on Maundy Thursday. Again *Christus factus est* and the *Miserére* are omitted. The usual prayer *Vísita, quaésumus Dómine* is said, but the conclusion *Per Dóminum* is said silently, and Compline concludes with this prayer.

II. *The Easter Vigil:*

Blessing of the New Fire

(1) The ceremonies begin at a suitable time (10:00-10:30), so as to allow the solemn Mass of the Easter vigil to start around midnight. The altars are covered with the altar-cloths, but the candles remain unlighted until the beginning of Mass. Meanwhile fire is struck from a flint outside the church, and charcoal is lighted from it.

(2) The celebrant is vested in amice, alb, cincture, stole, and purple cope.

(3) Assisted by the ministers who carry the cross, holy water, and incense, the priest blesses the new fire. This can take place either outside the entrance, or in the vestibule, or even inside of church, wherever the people can better follow the rite. The priest says:

V. Dóminus vobíscum. R. Et cum spíritu tuo. Orémus. Deus, qui per Fílium tuum, etc. (as given in the missal, omitting the two prayers which used to follow).

The fire is sprinkled with holy water three times, without saying anything.

(4) An acolyte takes some of the blessed charcoal and puts it into the censer. Then the priest places incense from the boat in the censer, blesses it in the usual way, and incenses the fire three times.

Blessing of the Paschal Candle

(5) After the blessing of the new fire, an acolyte brings the paschal candle to the middle and places it before the priest. Using a stylus the priest cuts a cross into the wax between the points marked for the insertion of the grains of incense. Next he carves the Greek letter *alpha* above the cross and below it the letter *oméga*, and within the arms of the cross the four numerals for the current year (see below). While making these symbols he says:

[1] Christus heri et hódie (as he cuts the vertical line of the cross),

[2] Princípium et Finis (cutting the tranverse line),

[3] Alpha (carving the letter *A* above the vertical line),

[4] et Oméga (carving the letter Ω below the vertical line),

[5] Ipsíus sunt témpora (as he cuts the first numeral of the current year in the upper left-hand angle)

[6] et saécula (cutting the second numeral in the upper left-hand angle);

[7] Ipsi glória et impérium (cutting the third numeral in the lower left-hand angle)

[8] per univérsa aeternitátis saécula. Amen (cutting the fourth numeral in the lower right-hand angle).

(6) After the cross and the other symbols have been carved, the deacon gives the priest the grains of incense, which if not yet blessed are blessed now by sprinkling them three times with holy water and incensing them three times, without saying anything. The celebrant next inserts the five grains in the candle in the holes prepared for them, the while he says:

[1] Per sua sancta vúlnera
[2] glóriosa
[3] custódiat
[4] et consérvet nos
[5] Christus Dóminus. Amen.

1
4 2 5
3

(7) Then the deacon hands the priest a small candle lighted from the new fire, with which he lights the paschal candle, saying as he does so:

Lumen Christi glorióse resurgéntis
Díssipet ténebras cordis et mentis.

(8) Thereupon the priest blesses the lighted paschal candle, saying:

V. Dóminus vobíscum. R. Et cum spíritu tuo. Orémus.
Véniat, quaésumus, omnípotens Deus, super hunc incénsum céreum larga tuae benedictiónis infúsio: et hunc noctúrnum splendórem invisíbilis regenerátor accénde; ut non solum sacrifícium, quod hac nocte litátum est, arcána lúminis tui admixtióne refúlgeat; sed in quocúmque loco ex hujus sanctificatiónis mystério áliquid fúerit

deportátum, expúlsa diabólicae fraudis nequítia, virtus tuae majestátis assístat. Per Christum Dóminum nostrum. R. Amen.

(9) In the meantime all lights in the church are put out, in order that later they can receive their light from the new fire.

The Solemn Procession and the Easter Hymn of Praise

(10) The deacon, now vested in white dalmatic, receives the lighted paschal candle, and the procession is formed in the following order: the thurifer leads the way, followed by the subdeacon carrying the processional cross, the deacon with lighted paschal candle, immediately after him the celebrant, and lastly the clergy and the people.

(11) When the deacon has entered the church, the procession halts. He raises the blessed candle, and as he remains standing, he intones: *Lumen Christi* to which all the others, as they genuflect to the blessed candle, respond: *Deo grátias.*

Here the priest lights his own candle from the blessed paschal candle.

Proceeding to the middle of the church, the deacon halts and here intones in a higher key the same words and melody: *Lumen Christi,* at which all genuflect as before and respond: *Deo grátias.*

At this time the candles of the clergy are lighted from the blessed paschal candle.

Thirdly the deacon proceeds to the altar, stopping in the middle of the sanctuary (or choir), and here intones in a still higher key: *Lumen Christi,* at which all genuflect as before and respond: *Deo grátias.*

Now the candles of the people are lighted from the blessed paschal candle, after which all lights in the church are put on.

(12) The priest goes to his place in the sanctuary (or choir), at the sedilia on the epistle side; the subdeacon with cross stands at the Gospel side; and the clergy take their places at the benches.

The deacon fixes the paschal candle on a low support which is set in the middle of the sanctuary (or choir). Receiving the book, he asks the blessing of the celebrant, as it is done at the Gospel in Mass. The priest says:

Dóminus sit in corde tuo, et in lábiis tuis: ut digne, et competénter annúnties suum paschále praecónium: In nómine Patris, et Fílii, + et Spíritus Sancti. Amen.

The deacon goes to the lectern which is covered with a white veil, places the book thereon, and incenses it three times. He also incenses the paschal candle, walking around it as he does so.

Hereupon all rise and remain standing throughout the time the deacon sings the Easter hymn, the same as at the Gospel in Mass.

(13) *Exultet* is sung without any pause whatsoever. Toward the very end there is one change in the text: instead of the former prayer for the Emperor: *Réspice étiam ad devotíssimum Imperatórem* etc., the revised text is as follows:

Ré-spi-ce é-ti-am ad e-os qui nos in po-te-stá-te re - gunt, et i-neffá-bi-li pietátis et mi-se-ri-córdi-ae tu-ae mú-ne-re, dí-ri-ge co-gi-ta-ti-ó-nes e-ó-rum ad ju-sti-ti-am et pa- cem, ut de ter-ré-na o-pe-ro-si- tá- te ad cae- léstem pá- tri- am per- vé- ni- ant cum om- ni pó- pu- lo tu- o. Per eúndem etc.

The Prophecies

(14) When the deacon has finished chanting the Easter hymn, he removes the white dalmatic and vests in a purple one, and joins the celebrant.

(15) Next the Scripture lessons are read, omitting the title and the customary response, *Deo grátias*. They are read by a lector who stands in the middle of the sanctuary (or choir) and in front of the paschal candle. The celebrant and his ministers, as well as the clergy and the people sit down and listen attentively.

(16) Immediately following the reading or the canticle, the prayers are said in this manner: when all have risen, the priest says *Orémus;* the deacon adds *Flectámus génua,* at which all kneel in silent prayer for some time, until the subdeacon says *Leváte*, whereupon all stand up, and the priest then says the prayer.

(17) Instead of the twelve readings hitherto prescribed in the Roman missal, now only four of them are read, namely, the first prophecy with the prayer, and the fourth, eighth, and eleventh with their respective canticles and prayers.

First Part of the Litany

(18) When the readings are finished, the Litany of the Saints is sung up to the invocation *Propítius esto*. The litany is led by two cantors, but all the people (kneeling) sing the responses. The invocations are no longer sung twice as they were formerly.

(19) If the church has a baptismal font, the ceremony continues as noted below in rubric no. 20; otherwise everything is omitted up to rubric no. 24.

Blessing of the Baptismal Water

(20) While the litany is sung, the cantors (and clergy) remain in the sanctuary before the blessed candle, in sight of the faithful. Meantime the vessel containing the water to be blessed and everything else required for the blessing is made ready.

(21) The blessing of baptismal water takes place according to the directions given in the Roman missal; however, the canticle *Sicut cervus,* along with its prayer, is omitted, beginning at once with *Dóminus vobíscum* and the prayer *Omnípotens sempitérne Deus, adésto.*

(22) But in those places where there is a baptistery separate from the church edifice, the ancient practice of blessing the baptismal water in the baptistery itself must be continued. In that case the priest, the vested ministrants, and the clergy go in procession to the baptismal font, led by the crucifer, acolytes with candlesticks, and a server who carries the lighted paschal candle. During this procession the canticle *Sicut cervus* is sung.

Before entering the baptistery, the priest stands facing the font, and says the prayer which follows the tract *Sicut cervus* in the missal.

(23) After the blessing the clergy return in silence to the church, and here the first part of the litany is begun.

Renewal of Baptismal Vows

(24) After the blessing of the baptismal water (or when this does not take place, then right after the first part of the litany), we proceed to the renewal of baptismal vows.

(25) The priest puts incense in the censer and incenses the paschal candle. Then, standing in front of the candle in the middle of the sanctuary (or choir) or in the ambo or pulpit, he addresses the people as follows:

On this sacred night, dearly beloved brethren, holy Mother Church, while recalling the death and burial of our Lord Jesus Christ, keeps loving watch for Him in return for His great love, and while awaiting His glorious resurrection, she is filled with the greatest joy.

For as the apostle teaches, we have been buried together with Christ through baptism unto death. And just as Christ has arisen from the dead, so we also ought to walk in newness of life, realizing that the old man in us has been crucified along with Christ, so that we may no longer be the servants of sin. Therefore, let us remember that we have died to sin, but that now we live for God, in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Wherefore, dearly beloved brethren, now that the purification of Lent has been accomplished, let us renew the promises we made in holy baptism, in which we formerly renounced Satan and his works, as well as the world, all of them the enemies of God. And let us promise to serve God faithfully in the Catholic Church.

Priest: Do you renounce Satan?

People: We do renounce him.

Priest: And all his works?

People: We do renounce them.

Priest: And all his allurements?

People: We do renounce them.

Priest: Do you believe in God, the Father almighty, Creator of heaven and earth?

People: We do believe.

Priest: Do you believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, who was born for us and who suffered for us?

People: We do believe.

Priest: Do you believe in the Holy Spirit, the holy Catholic Church, the communion of Saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting?

People: We do believe.

Priest: Now let us all pray together to God, as our Lord Jesus Christ taught us to pray:

People: Our Father. . . .

Priest: And may God almighty, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has caused us to be born anew by water and the Holy Spirit, and granted us remission of sins, may He preserve us by His grace in the selfsame Christ Jesus, our Lord, unto life everlasting.

People: Amen.

(26) Wherever a partial use of the vernacular tongue is allowed

in conferring the sacrament of baptism, as directed in a duly authorized ritual, in those places the full text given under no. 25 may be said also in the vernacular (N.B. this applies in the U. S.).

Second Part of the Litany

(27) Following the renewal of baptismal vows, the cantors begin the second part of the litany, from *Propítius esto* to the end; during which all present kneel and make the responses.

If holy orders are conferred in the course of this sacred night of Easter, then the customary prostration and blessing of the men being ordained takes place while this last part of the litany is sung.

(28) The priest and the ministers repair to the sacristy, where they put on the white vestments for the solemn celebration of Mass.

(29) In the meantime the paschal candle is placed in its candelabrum on the Gospel side of the altar, and the altar is prepared for solemn Mass, with lighted candles and flowers.

The Solemn Mass of the Easter Vigil

(1) At the end of the litany, the cantors solemnly intone the *Kyrie* of the Mass as usual. While the *Kyrie* is being sung, the priest and his ministers, vested in white, come to the altar. The psalm *Júdica me* is omitted, as well as the *Confíteor*. The priest ascends directly to the altar predella, kisses the altar, and incenses it in the customary way.

(2) When the *Kyrie* is finished, the priest intones the *Glória* in the solemn tone, and during this hymn the church bells are rung. (The Mass continues according to the directions in the missal for Holy Saturday, except for the following changes: 1. the former vesper service is omitted; 2. the former antiphon for the *Magnificat* is now used for the communion verse, and what was once the oration of Vespers is now the post-communion prayer of Mass; 3. after the priest's blessing, the last Gospel is omitted, and the ministrants return at once to the sacristy.)

COMMENTARY

Divine Office: Except where the Divine Office is said in choral recitation, Holy Saturday in the new order becomes an "aliturgical" day, a day without any liturgy, notably lacking the celebration of the Eucharist. The various hours of the Divine Office, when chanted publicly and solemnly, should take place at the proper time of the day, but obviously this has no bearing upon private reci-

tation. The psalm *Miserére* is omitted at the end of all the sacred functions of Holy Saturday, because it is not consonant with the joy already felt by the Church over the imminent victory of her Spouse, and the new oration *Concéde* gives explicit expression to such sentiments.

Blessing of New Fire: It is recommended that the blessing of the new fire be held outside the church edifice, so that the people can gather around it. To be really impressive, it ought to be a great bonfire, rather than the feeble thing ordinarily seen. Depending on the location of the church, this might have to be curtailed, especially if it would cause fire-department and police to descend upon the conflagration with ensuing arrests for disturbing the peace. Yet if it needs be a token fire confined to a fireproof container, the latter could at least be a vessel having some semblance of propriety in serving for a solemn blessing. The liturgy always speaks of "decent" appurtenances and materials for its various functions. Only in case of inclement weather should the fire be blessed in the vestibule or inside the edifice. Engage a boy scout or some resourceful man to strike the fire from a flint, and let it be lit before the celebrant and his officiants arrive on the scene. Only one prayer is used for the blessing. While the priest says it in Latin, another person would do well to read aloud the vernacular by the light of the bonfire, or if this is insufficient, by aid of a flashlight. At any rate, no burning candles or other lights should be in evidence until after the paschal candle has been lit from the new fire. The prayer used formerly in blessing the grains of incense has been restored to its proper place and time (at the blessing of the paschal candle), since historians of the liturgy have been pointing out for a long time that a misunderstanding has caused it to refer to the incense, instead of its true reference to the burning candle: *hunc incénsum céreum*. In smaller churches, i.e. where a deacon and subdeacon do not assist, the celebrant wears the purple cope until rubric no. 10.

Blessing of Paschal Candle: The reed or triple candle is no longer used; in fact, it never had any special significance. A very happy innovation, or better, a restoration, is the ceremony of carving on the paschal candle a cross, the letters *alpha* and *oméga,* and the numerals for the current year. Along with the words said during the act, this rite recalls the Easter piety of the ancient Church—the firm and joyous conviction that time and the ages are inter-

preted in the light of the Easter mystery, and receive their consecration from Christ forever risen in victory over the enemies of hapless man. The stylus employed to carve the symbols may be some sort of blunt-edged metal with a wooden handle. Someone has suggested that the tool be made thus: drive a large nail into the end of a wooden handle and clip off the head of the nail. The metal then can be warmed at a flame, so as to facilitate cutting into the wax. Moreover, a neater product would result if the figures were traced on the candle beforehand. The grains of incense with the red waxen nails are blessed at this time only if they have not been blessed and used hitherto. A purist might object to this rite on the grounds that it is late Mediaeval, and accentuates too much the note of the suffering Messiah. Yet we speak of the Saviour's glorious wounds, and the Gospel bears witness that they were still visible following His resurrection. They are certainly a fitting ornament on the candle which is the symbol of Christ, the conqueror. As a last act before it is blessed, the candle is lit from the new fire. All this, it should be remembered, happens on the spot where the lighting and blessing of the fire occurs. Therefore, it is well to guard the flame received from the fire within a lantern, in order to have it available at all times for re-lighting the paschal candle, should it be extinguished by a draft.

The Procession and Lumen Christi: One of the most dramatic acts in the new rite is the lighting of candles from the flame of the paschal candle—those of the celebrant, the clergy, and all participants, and finally all other lights in church (*lumen Christi: lumen meum*). The Oriental rite has always retained this very ancient and impressive ceremony. In a church which has received consecration, it should not be forgotten to light the "apostle" candles beneath the twelve consecrated crosses. The rubric directs that the people are to take part in the procession, entering the church after they have assisted at the blessing of the fire. If the number in attendance is large, one can foresee a difficulty here, a problem best solved by the individual pastor according to local circumstances. No difficulty should be made, however, of supplying each person present with a candle, lest the whole effect envisioned by this directive be lost.

The Paschal Hymn of Praise: While this beautiful hymn is sung, all stand and keep their lighted candles in hand. The former

interruptions during this hymn have been abolished, because they owed their introduction to a misinterpretation of the text. The prayer for the emperor has been deleted. In its stead we have a most necessary and meaningful prayer for the head of state.

The Prophecies: We have commented above (Part I) on the reduction of the number of readings from the Old Testament—now four instead of twelve. Where the full rite of singing the prophecies cannot be adhered to, it is to be hoped that they will be read in the vernacular for the people's edification and instruction, while the celebrant reads the Latin text in a subdued tone. The new rite provides very fittingly for a silent period of meditation on each leason after it has been read.

Blessing of Baptismal Water and Renewal of Baptismal Vows: The blessing of baptismal water takes place in the sanctuary, in front of the paschal candle, and in sight of the congregation. Here again we have the Holy See's solicitude that the people may see, hear, and assist at all the functions of this holy night. If it is not too inconvenient, the font may be moved into the sanctuary for this blessing. The tract *Sicut cervus* is sung as a processional hymn only if there is a special baptistery apart from the church edifice, which happens to be the case in the Lateran basilica and several other places. The short homily, which is introductory to the renewal of baptismal vows, is compiled from St. Paul's letter to the Romans and from a sermon of St. Augustine. In the renewal of vows above all, the people are given an opportunity to be vocal in their participation, and thus the rubric provides for their benefit the use of the vernacular.

Solemn Mass of the Easter Vigil: The Vesper service, formerly sung during the last part of Mass, is dropped for obvious reasons, and the prayers at the foot of the altar, as well as the last Gospel are omitted, owing to a desire to have the Mass on this night resemble as closely as possible the ancient Roman ritual for the Eucharist. The onetime antiphon for the *Magnificat* becomes the communion verse, and its prayer the post-communion oration. Noteworthy is the rubric which directs that *all* sing the *alleúia*, repeating it all three times after the celebrant has intoned it, whereas formerly the rubric specified that it be sung only by the choir.

PHILIP T. WELLER
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

SUPPLEMENT

After the foregoing article had gone to press, a new decree, dated Jan. 11, 1952, was issued by the Congregation of Sacred Rites. The new decree, printed below, first of all extends for a period of three years the faculty of celebrating the Easter vigil at nighttime. Besides it contains a number of directives, the purpose of which is to solve various questions brought up in the reports submitted by bishops who allowed the restored rite to be held in 1951. The directives are, to put it mildly, very interesting. Many an inducement is held out to priests to put aside hesitation about adopting the new rite, as a reading of the text will reveal.

DECREE OF THE CONGREGATION OF SACRED RITES

dated January 11, 1952

extending for a period of three years the faculty to celebrate the Restored Easter Vigil Service, including some changes in rubrics and directives

By a decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, issued on February 9, 1951, the bishop of a diocese was granted the faculty to restore, if he saw fit, the celebration of the Easter vigil to the night hours. At that time the faculty was given for one year, and it was in the nature of an experiment. The new service was celebrated in a great many dioceses throughout the world, and with finest success indeed, despite the little time intervening between the promulgation of the decree and the occurrence of the feast.

Many of the bishops who used the aforesaid faculty have sent to this congregation the report requested on the celebration of the Easter vigil, generously praising the restored rite, referring to the copious spiritual benefits resulting therefrom, and begging that the faculty be extended for a longer time. Yet quite a number of the bishops, after hearing the reports from pastors, did not neglect to bring up certain doubts and difficulties in respect of observing the restored rite, having in mind that the Holy See would settle these difficulties and solve any questions by giving proper directives.

His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, has ordered the same special commission of experts that prepared the vigil service to make a careful study of the reports mentioned above. Having discussed and weighed the matter fully, the commission has decided that the faculty for celebrating the restored Easter vigil should be confirmed and prolonged for a period of three years, if it so please His Holiness. But certain changes in the rubrics and directives have been added.

Finally, on the recommendation of the undersigned Cardinal Pro-prefect of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, His Holiness has deigned to approve the directives and changes in the rubrics which are given below. The bishop of a diocese is granted the faculty for three years to allow the celebration of the restored Easter vigil, as his prudent judgment will dictate. Moreover, the publishing of the liturgical rite and ceremonies of this sacred vigil is still reserved to the Holy See, anything to the contrary notwithstanding.

January 11, 1952

L. ✠ S.

✠ C. Cardinal Micara, Bishop of Velletri, Pro-prefect
† A. Carinci, Archbishop of Seleucia, Secretary

DIRECTIVES

In the following directives, the term "Easter vigil" is understood to mean the restored Easter vigil, that namely which is celebrated at nighttime.

I. Preparation for the Easter vigil

1. In order that the faithful may assist with greater benefit at the celebration of the holy Easter vigil, especially at the solemn renewal of baptismal vows, it will be of great help to prepare them for it during Lent, by means of suitable instructions.

2. Moreover, careful prepartions and arrangements should be made to have everything in readiness for a devout and becoming observance of the holy Easter vigil. Besides, the sacred ministers or other assistants, whether clergy or laymen, above all if the latter are boys, should be thoroughly instructed in the ceremonies they are to perform.

II. The proper time for celebrating the Easter vigil

3. The proper time for celebrating the Easter vigil is the hour appointed in the official rubrics (under Title II, ch. I, no. 1), namely at a time that will allow the solemn Mass of the Easter vigil to start around midnight.

4. But if the bishop of a diocese decides that the vigil observance cannot be held in some churches at the time prescribed, for reasons both serious and for the public good, he is empowered, after fully weighing all the circumstances, to allow the sacred celebration to be anticipated in these churches, no earlier, however, than 8:00 P.M.

III. The rite to be observed in celebrating the Easter vigil

5. Wherever there are sufficient priests or men in orders, the Easter vigil should be celebrated in solemn manner, according to the rubrics given in the rite for Holy Saturday.

6. But in churches where there is a lack of priests or men in orders, the special rubrics given in their proper place within the same rite for Holy Saturday are to be followed.

7. Lastly, wherever the sacred liturgy is performed in the morning of Holy Saturday, everything is carried out according to the rite contained in the Roman missal.

IV. Annotations to certain rubrics in the Easter vigil

8. There is nothing to stop one from marking the paschal candle beforehand with the signs that the priest will later carve with the stylus. This can be done with colored crayon or with some other visible mark.

9. It is fitting that the candles which the clergy and people have in hand be kept lighted during the singing of the Easter hymn of praise, as well as during the renewal of baptismal vows.

10. It is permissible to decorate the vessel containing the water that is to be blessed.

11. Should it happen that holy orders will be conferred in the course of this sacred vigil, the following change is made in the rubrics: instead of bestowing the pontifical blessing before the final admonition (the one in which the bishop imposes the so-called "duties"), on this night the bishop will first speak the admonition, and then give the pontifical blessing.

12. Finally, in those churches where the restored Easter vigil has taken place, when the vigil of Pentecost occurs it will be allowed to omit the lessons or prophecies and also the litany and the blessing of baptismal water, and Mass can start at once with the Introit *Cum sanctificatus fuero,* just as the Roman missal now provides for a private Mass. This will apply even if it is a conventual Mass and even if it is a solemn or a sung Mass.

V. Mass, Holy Communion, and the Eucharistic fast

13. Priests who will have offered the Mass of the restored Easter vigil may celebrate Mass again on Easter day, in fact, two or three times if they have the indult.

14. The faithful who will have assisted at the Mass of the Easter vigil celebrated at the prescribed time, that is, after midnight, will have fulfilled the precept of hearing Mass on Easter Sunday.

15. If the Ordinary himself should wish to celebrate the sacred Easter vigil, he may offer a pontifical Mass again on Easter Sunday, although he is not obliged to do so.

16. "Holy Communion may not be administered on Holy Saturday except during the Mass or directly and immediately upon its completion (Canon 867, 3)."

17. Since "no one is allowed to receive the Holy Eucharist again on the same day he has already received (Canon 857)," therefore, those who have received Holy Communion on Holy Saturday morning may do so again during the Mass of the Easter vigil, provided it is celebrated at the time prescribed, that is, after midnight; but they absolutely may not in the special case when the Mass of the restored vigil service is anticipated before midnight, as provided in rubric no. 4 given above. Likewise, those who have received Communion at the Mass of the Easter vigil held during the night, that is, after midnight, may not approach the holy table again on Easter Sunday morning.

18. Relative to the Eucharistic fast, the following points are to be observed:

a. priests who will celebrate the Mass of the Easter vigil at midnight, and likewise the faithful who will receive Communion therein, must fast at least from 10:00 P.M. onward; but in the special case when the sacred vigil is anticipated before midnight (see rubric no. 4 above), the fast must be observed at least from 7:00 P.M. onward;

b. moreover, priests who will have offered the vigil Mass after midnight, and wish to celebrate again on the following morning, may take some nourishment in the form of liquid after the night Mass, yet keeping the Eucharistic fast at least one hour before beginning the next Mass on Easter Sunday morning, and with due regard for any special indult which provides otherwise, if one enjoys such an indult.

19. "The law of fasting ceases at noon of Holy Saturday (Canon 1252, 4)," even when the restored Easter vigil is observed.

VI. Solution to some of the difficulties

20. Where the custom prevails of blessing homes on Holy Saturday, the bishop of a diocese should see to it that this blessing is carried out at a more suitable time, by the pastor or by other priests who have the care of souls.

21. Wherever it is established practice for the faithful to come in droves to confession on the evening of Holy Saturday or on Easter Sunday morning, the pastor should make an effort on occasion to persuade the faithful not to flock together all on one and the same day for the Easter confessions; for surely if they are distributed over a number of days, far better results will be realized.

22. The ringing of bells prescribed at the intonation of the *Gloria in excelsis* will take place as follows:

a. in places where there is only one church, the bells should be rung while the hymn is being sung;

b. but in places where there are a number of churches, the bells of all churches in that place should be rung together at the time the bells of the mother church or principal church begin their peals, namely when the hymn is intoned in the latter. This applies whether the sacred services are celebrated in all churches at the same time or whether at different times. When in doubt as to which is the mother or principal church of the town, the Ordinary should be consulted.

23. Lastly, concerning any popular devotions which are an established custom on Holy Saturday in many places of the world, the bishop of the diocese along with the pastors should see to it that such devotions, which seem to foster and promote solid piety, are discreetly accommodated to the new rite for Holy Saturday.

RUBRICS TO BE OBSERVED ON HOLY SATURDAY IF THE RESTORED EASTER VIGIL IS CELEBRATED INCLUDING SOME CHANGES APPROVED BY DECREE OF JANUARY 11, 1952

Part I

The Divine Office

Rubric no. 4 has been changed, so that it now reads: Compline is omitted on this night.

The following are new additions to the rubrics for the Divine Office:

5. Because the solemn celebration of the restored Easter vigil takes the place of the night office for Easter Sunday, Matins of Easter is omitted. Lauds is sung in the course of the Mass, as indicated below in part III, nos. 3, 4, 5. Thus the Office for Easter Sunday is taken up at Prime.

6. However, when the sacred ceremonies of the Easter vigil take place on Holy Saturday morning, the entire Divine Office of Holy Saturday and also Matins and Lauds of Easter Sunday is completed in its entirety, as prescribed in their proper place in the breviary and missal.

Part II

The Easter Vigil

The new decree also indicates how the rite is to be carried out when a single priest officiates, minus deacon or subdeacon or

other clergy, and only with the aid of servers. The following points will clarify what the procedure is when this happens to be the case:

Cfr. rubric no. 10: The celebrant, now vested in white dalmatic, takes the lighted paschal candle, and the procession is formed in the following order: the thurifer leads the way, followed by the cross-bearer, immediately after him the celebrant with lighted paschal candle, and lastly the other servers and the people.

Cfr. rubric no. 11: When the priest has entered the church, the procession halts. He raises the blessed candle, and as he remains standing, he intones: *Lumen Christi* to which all the others, as they genuflect to the blessed candle, respond: *Deo gratias.* Then one of the servers lights a candle for the priest from the blessed candle. Proceeding to the middle of the church, the priests halts and here intones in a higher key the same words and melody, etc. At this time the candles of the servers are lighted from the blessed paschal candle. Thirdly the priest proceeds to the altar, stopping in the middle of the sanctuary, and here intones in a still higher key, etc. Now the candles of the people are lighted, after which all lights in the church are put on.

Crf. rubric no. 12: The priest fixes the paschal candle on a low support which is set in the middle of the sanctuary, then he goes to the credence-table; the cross-bearer holding the processional cross stands at the Gospel side; and the rest of the servers go to their respective places. The celebrant takes the book from the credence-table, goes to the altar-step and kneels, and omitting the prayer *Munda cor meum* he says only the following: *Jube, Domine, benedicere. Dominus sit in corde meo, et in labiis meis: ut digne, et competenter annuntiem suum paschale praeconium. Amen.*

Cfr. rubric no. 13: The priest goes to the lectern which is covered with a white veil, places the book thereon, and incenses it three times. He also incenses the paschal candle, walking around it as he does so. Hereupon all rise and remain standing throughout the time the Easter hymn is sung. The priest himself sings the paschal hymn, standing in front of the paschal candle, so that the altar is to his right and the nave of the church to his left.

Cfr. rubric no. 14: After the chanting of the Easter hymn, the celebrant goes to the credence-table, removes the dalmatic and

white stole, vests in purple stole and cope, and returns to the lectern.

Cfr. rubric no. 15: Next the Scripture lessons are read, omitting the title and the customary response, *Deo gratias.* They are read by the celebrant who stands in the middle of the sanctuary and in front of the paschal candle, so that the altar is to his right and the nave of the church to his left. The servers and the people sit down and listen attentively. If, however, there is a cleric at hand to act as lector, everything is done as in no. 15 above.

Cfr. rubric no. 16: Immediately following the reading or the singing of the canticle, the prayers are said in this manner: when all have risen, the priest—remaining at the lectern—says *Oremus. Flectamus genua,* at which the priest and all present kneel in silent prayer for some time, until the priest himself says *Levate,* whereupon all stand up, and the priest then says the prayer.

Cfr. rubric no. 18: The litany is led by two cantors, or for want of them, by the priest himself who kneels on the lowest altar-step. All the people (kneeling) sing the responses, etc.

Cfr. rubric no. 20: While the litany is sung, the vessel containing the water to be blessed and everything else required for the blessing is made ready. The vessel is placed in the middle of the sanctuary, in front of the paschal candle, and in sight of the people.

Cfr. rubric no. 21: During the blessing of baptismal water, the priest stands facing the people, so that the vessel of water is in front of him, the paschal candle to his right, and to his left the server who holds the cross. The blessing of baptismal water takes place according to the directions given in the Roman missal; however, the canticle *Sicut cervus,* along with its prayer is omitted, beginning at once with *Dominus vobiscum* and the prayer *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, adesto.* Also omitted is the sprinkling of the people with the blessed water, which used to take place before the holy oils were mixed with the water. Therefore, the rubric which begins: "then the priests who take part sprinkle the people with this water," as well as that which concerns the sprinkling of the water and the admixture of sacred oils, is changed to read as follows: "then one of the assistants puts some of the water into another vessel, to be used later for sprinkling the people after the

renewal of baptismal vows (see no. 25 below) and for blessing homes and also for other purposes. After this the priest who blesses the font pours Oil of Catechumens into the water in the form of a cross, saying in an audible voice, etc.

After the blessing the baptismal water is taken in solemn procession to the font. The thurifer goes first, followed by the cross-bearer, the servers, then one or several of the servers who carry the vessel with baptismal water, and lastly the priest. The paschal candle is left in its place. During the procession the canticle *Sicut cervus* (which was omitted at the beginning) is sung. As soon as the water has been poured into the font, the celebrant says *Dominus vobiscum* and the prayer *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, respice,* and then he incenses the font. Afterward all return in silence to the sanctuary, and one begins the renewal of baptismal vows.

Cfr. rubric no. 22: But in those places where there is a baptistery separate from the church edifice, and one prefers to perform the blessing of the baptismal water within the baptistery itself, the ceremony proceeds as follows. Right after the invocation of the litany *Sancta Trinitas, unus Deus, miserere nobis,* the priest goes in procession to the font, preceded by the cross-bearer, the acolytes with candles, the minister (or server) who carries the lighted paschal candle, the clergy (or the servers), and the vested ministrants (if there are such). However, the cantors and the people remain in their place and continue singing the litany, repeating if necessary the invocations starting at *Sancta Maria, ora pro nobis.* The blessing of baptismal water takes place as given in the Roman missal, but omitting the sprinkling of the people with the blessed water, as is customarily done before adding the holy oils. When the blessing is over, all return in silence to the church, and one begins the renewal of baptismal vows.

Cfr. rubric no. 25: Immediately following the renewal of baptismal vows, the priest sprinkles the people with the blessed water taken from the vessel used in the blessing of baptismal water, as explained above in rubric no. 21. In the case where there has been no blessing of baptismal water, he uses ordinary holy water.

Cfr. rubric no. 26: The allocution and renewal of baptismal vows may be spoken in the vernacular in all countries; but the text must be approved by the Ordinary.

Cfr. rubric no. 28: If there are no cantors and the celebrant himself has to sing the litany, he finishes the litany, and then repairs to the sacristy with the servers, and all vest as stated above.

Part III

The Solemn Mass of the Easter Vigil

Cfr. rubric no. 2: After consuming the Precious Blood, the ablutions are taken and the chalice purified as usual. Then Lauds for Easter Sunday is sung in choir, using the antiphon: *Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia* with the psalm *Laudate Dominum, omnes gentes,* repeating the antiphon *Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.* The chapter, hymn, and verse are not said, but the celebrant intones the antiphon for the Benedictus: *Et valde mane* and the choir continues: *una sabbatorum, veniunt ad monumentum, orto jam sole, alleluia* (the same antiphon as in the breviary for Lauds of Easter Sunday). The Benedictus is sung, concluding with *Gloria Patri,* and the altar is incensed as usual.

Cfr. rubric no. 4: Following the repetition of the antiphon, the celebrant says in the usual way *Dominus vobiscum,* and the prayer or postcommunion *Spiritum nobis, Domine,* as given in the missal.

Cfr. rubric no. 5: Lastly the priest says *Dominus vobiscum,* and the deacon (or the priest himself) turning toward the people sings *Ite, missa est, alleluia, alleluia.* Having said *Placeat tibi, sancta Trinitas,* the priest gives the blessing in the accustomed manner. The last Gospel is omitted, and all return to the sacristy.

P. T. W.

Answers to Questions

A CASE OF RESTITUTION

Question: A small boy, playing baseball, breaks a window in the rectory. May the priest in justice demand that the boy's father pay the bill for the repair of the damage?

Answer: Several distinctions are necessary for the solution of this problem. If the boy has not reached the age of reason and his father, through neglect of supervision, was responsible for the destructive activity of his son, the father is bound in conscience to make good the damage. Such would be the case if the father knew that the boy was playing too close to the rectory and did nothing about it. If, however, the damage was done without any culpable neglect on the part of the father, there is no obligation on this latter (at least prior to a court sentence) to pay for the window. In that event the occurrence is to be considered a mere accident, like the breaking of a window by a hail-storm.

If the son has attained the use of reason, he himself is a responsible person, and hence, if the damage was due to his own deliberate carelessness, he is bound to make up for it. If he has no funds at present, he is bound to earn some money for this purpose. Even if the father was guilty of the failure to admonish his son about his indifference to the rights and the property of others, the father would not *per se* be bound to make restitution. As Merkelbach states: "Parents are not bound to make restitution for the damage done by their children who have sufficient use of reason, because they are not bound by a duty of justice to safeguard the property of others, unless their silence would be equivalent to approval or protection" *(Summa theologiae moralis* [Paris, 1941], II, n. 316).

However, if the civil law obliges a careless parent to make reparation for the damage done by his son, the father is bound in conscience to pay the debt. Hence, a person who is the victim of the destructive actions of a small boy is perfectly within his rights if he brings suit aganist the child's father.

THE Rh FACTOR AND RHYTHM

Question: Is the fact that the Rh factor renders it very improbable that a couple can bring healthy children into the world a sufficient reason for the permanent practice of Rhythm?

Answer: It would seem that a physical condition such as the questioner describes would fully justify the use of Rhythm in the marital relations of the couple, even during the entire period of their married life when the conception of offspring is possible. For when it is established by competent medical testimony that the Rh factor exists, there is great probability that the wife will not be able to bring a living child into the world, and that, even if a child is born alive, it will be afflicted with a grave physical ailment. The recent pronouncement of Pope Pius XII on the duties of married life (in his instruction to midwives) asserted that conditions may exist which will justify the permanent use of Rhythm. The case presented by the questioner would seem to be one to which the Pope's statement is applicable. It should be added, however, that this solution would no longer hold if at some future time medical science would discover an effective remedy for the Rh factor.

PERMISSION TO USE CONFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE

Question: If a penitent has confessed a certain sin, and subsequently another person approaches the confessor and states that the penitent has given him permission to discuss the matter with the confessor, may this latter speak with the third party about the subject brought up in confession, with the assurance that he is not violating the grave obligation of the sacramental seal?

Answer: A person who has confessed a sin in the sacred tribunal of Penance may give the confessor the right to discuss this matter outside of confession, either with the penitent himself or with a third party. The extent of this discussion is limited to those topics which the penitent freely permits to be the subject of the conversation (Cf. Cappello, *De Sacramentis* [Rome, 1938], II, n. 924). There is no intrinsic reason why this permission, relative to the discussion of the matter of confession with a third party, should not be communicated to the confessor from the penitent through this third party. Ordinarily, however, it would not be safe for a

confessor to act on the statement of a third party to the effect that the penitent has given permission to him to discuss confessional matter with the priest. Before this could be done the confessor would have to be sure that the permission was given freely; he would have to be certain of the extent to which he may proceed in the discussion of the sin or sins in question. Rarely could he have such certainty. The proper course for the priest to follow under ordinary circumstances when a third party informs him that a permission of this kind has been granted by a penitent is to state that the matter will not be discussed unless the penitent personally tells the confessor that he may speak and declares definitely with what topics the conversation may be concerned.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

SACRED PARTICLES

Question: (a) Is it lawful to pour communion particles from one-half empty ciborium into another, especially when the priest expects that most of them will be consumed at the Mass? (b) If a second priest is going to help with the distribution of Holy Communion may he begin to do so after the consecration of the Mass with the ciborium just consecrated at the Mass?

Answer: (a) Rubricists constantly admonish against mixing Hosts just consecrated at Mass with Hosts that have been previously consecrated. On an occasion, like Christmas or Easter, when the number of communicants is very large and there is grave danger of running out of Sacred Particles, one perhaps would be justified in mixing freshly consecrated Hosts with those already consecrated.

(b) The Sacred Congregation of Rites (#3448) has very definitely stated that the newly consecrated Hosts are intimately connected with the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and are not to be removed by another priest to distribute Holy Communion until after the Celebrant has received Holy Communion himself.

BENEDICTION DIFFICULTIES

Question: (a) Recently we had exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. I was wearing violet or purple vestments and became

confused about the color of the cope. I wore white thinking I would be correct. Now I wonder if I made a mistake. (b) We are expecting the Bishop to confirm in our parish soon. At Pontifical Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament which follows Confirmation are we to supply a deacon and subdeacon? (c) Does the thurifer swing the thurible during the blessing with the ostensorium? I have seen some do it while at other places the practice is not in vogue.

Answer: (a) If exposition or Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament follows immediately after Mass and the priest removes the chasuble and maniple at the sedilia, he wears a cope the color of the day. So our good inquirer did err and should have worn the violet or purple cope. However, the humeral veil is always white, regardless of the color of the cope. (b) Father Fortescue informs us that when a Bishop celebrates Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament there should always be a deacon and subdeacon. He likewise indicates that, if possible, another priest or deacon should be present to expose and repose the Blessed Sacrament. (c) There is no directive stating that the thurifer must swing the thurible during the act of benediction with the Blessed Sacrament. However, the Sacred Congregation of Rites has gone on record to state that if such custom has existed it may be continued.

MASS FOR THE SECOND DAY OF FORTY HOURS' DEVOTION

Question: Must one always say the Missa Pro Pace on the second day of the Forty Hours' Devotion? If so, are there any specific regulations concerning this Mass?

Answer: The Mass of the second day of the Forty Hours' Devotion need not necessarily be the Missa Pro Pace. It may be some other votive Mass selected and ordered by the Bishop of the diocese. Father Unger in his handbook for Forty Hours' tells us that it is proper for the Mass of the second day to have some relation to the petitions for which this special devotion to the Eucharist is held.

The public votive Mass for the second day should not be celebrated at the altar of exposition if at all possible. Only in cases

of necessity or because of a grave reason may this Mass take place at the altar of exposition. The absence of side altars would of necessity demand the use of the altar where the Blessed Sacrament is exposed.

The Missa Pro Pace requires that violet vestments be worn. The Gloria is not said but the Credo is always said. The oration of the Blessed Sacrament must be said but never added to the oration of the Mass under one conclusion. This Mass is never said on days when a public votive Mass is forbidden.

CORRECT WAY TO WEAR THE STOLE

Question: What is the correct manner of wearing the stole? Should it rest on the neck or should it be placed between the shoulders?

Answer: Father O'Connell in his monumental work states that the stole is to be placed between the shoulders and specifically not around the neck. Anson holds for the same opinion and gives as a reason that then it becomes unnecessary to sew a piece of linen on the stole as a safeguard against soiling the material. The Missal is clear on this point and states that the stole "imponit medium ejus in collo." The "Laws of Holy Mass" translates this as: "and places the middle of it on his neck." This seems to be the general custom of priests in this country.

HOLY SATURDAY SERVICES

Question: Are we free to arrange Holy Saturday and Easter Sunday services according to the rubrics as issued last spring?

Answer: The original permission to follow the vigil Easter services with the new arrangement of lessons, etc., was given only for 1951. A recent decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, however, has extended this permission for the next three years.

LEONINE PRAYER DIFFICULTY

Question: When the Leonine prayers are recited must they of necessity be said in English? After a Requiem High Mass is one permitted to recite one or two Our Fathers for the repose of the soul for whom the Mass has been offered?

Answer: Father O'Connell in his book states that the Leonine prayers "may be recited in Latin or in the vernacular, in a version approved by the Ordinary."

All the rubricists direct that after a Requiem High Mass the celebrant returns to the sacristy or goes at once to the sedilia to prepare for the absolution. No mention is made of the recitation of any prayers and only such that might be ordered by the bishop of the diocese would be said at this time.

GOOD FRIDAY

Question: At a Low Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday would "Incensum istud, etc." be said? I presume that the incense would be used during the procession and on having reached the altar but I have been unable to determine whether the regular incensing of the altar would take place in a Low Mass.

Answer: Our inquirer is correct in incensing during the procession and after the return to the main altar where the Mass of the Presanctified takes place. However, there will be no incensation of the altar during the Low Mass, since the general rules for Low Mass are followed at which time we do not incense the altar.

VESTMENTS

Question: Are vestments of nylon material or even plastic materials permitted?

Answer: Father Sadlowski in his recent work on Sacred Furnishings in speaking about vestment materials says that silk, gold and silver are the only materials that can be licitly used for the outer vestments. The gold and silver material must actually be made of gold or silver thread and not merely gold or silvered colored material. Until the present time, no ruling has been given by the Sacred Congregation of Rites about vestments made of nylon or plastic. Father Sadlowski concludes that "until a decree is forthcoming on the matter, it appears to be illicit to use this material (nylon or plastic) for vestments, even though it (nylon) is generally regarded to have the same appearance, texture, and value as silk."

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Book Reviews

CARDINAL SPELLMAN'S PRAYER BOOK. New York: The Edward O'Toole Co. Pp. xxii+693.

This is an exceptionally good and useful manual of prayers. The material is divided into five parts. The fifth section contains the Ordinary of the Mass and the Propers of the Masses of the Sundays and the principal feast-days throughout the year. The first four contain prayers for each day, for each day in the week, for each month in the year, and certain selected prayers and novenas popular among Catholics. Most of the prayers included in this volume are indulgenced, and may be used for public devotions. Some, however, like the litanies of St. Anne and of St. Theresa of the Child Jesus, are intended only for private devotion. The completeness of this volume, and the excellence of the many points of information that tend to aid the Catholic in his life of prayer, make this prayer book one which can and undoubtedly will be productive of great spiritual good.

The appearance of this book at this time is providential. In the midst of the tumult and confusion engendered by the noisy opponents of the Church who try to make the American people imagine that the work of the Catholic Church and of its hierarchy is political in its orientation, the publication of this magnificently planned manual of prayers gives unquestionable evidence of the fact that the one essential business and preoccupation of the Church is that service and acknowledgment of God which we know by the name of religion, the service and acknowledgment in which and by which the Church brings its children through this life of trial and preparation into the glory of the Beatific Vision in heaven.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

THE CONCEPT OF THE DIOCESAN PRIESTHOOD. By Joseph Clifford Fenton. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1951. Pp. 181. $3.25.

Monsignor Fenton here gives us priests an analysis and appreciation of our dogmatic Magna Charta, together with rich moral, ascetical and pastoral indications concerning the use we must make of the priesthood we exercise under it.

The busy author has brought together from Scripture, the magisterium of the Church and the writings of established theologians his manifold commentary on the concept of the diocesan priesthood. The result is a pioneer book on the subject in English, an impressive con-

tribution to the bibliography of recent studies of the priesthood already rich in French, German, and Latin works but almost neglected in our tongue since Manning's *The Eternal Priesthood.* It is of the English cardinal's book that readers will think on taking up Monsignor Fenton's study.

Most welcome is the emphasis on the parochial structure of the Church which, while in no way deviating toward "parochialism" in any unsavory sense, highlights the presence of the secular priest at the focal points of most intimate contact between the Church (which is to say, Christ) and the souls of men, particularly the souls of the poor.

Monsignor Fenton reveals a particular felicity in his discussion of the objective of the diocesan priesthood and the special spiritual perfection of that calling. On the latter point he seeks in recent papal pronouncements concerning the priesthood modern applications of the theological principles of St. Thomas Aquinas.

Of special interest to the reader of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* will be the seemingly "extra" chapter on devotion to the Holy Ghost and its American advocates. At first reading this tenth chapter might seem unrelated to the thesis and main body of Monsignor Fenton's book. Upon reflection, however, the inclusion of an historical chapter setting forth the consistent devotion of representative American clergy to the ideal of priestly perfection held forth by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, forms an admirable conclusion to a book which the learned author clearly intends for the instruction, edification and profit of priests in the United States.

In the spirit typical of the loyal diocesan priest that he himself is, Monsignor Fenton dedicates his book to the new bishop of his own diocese, the Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, D.D., Bishop of Springfield, Massachusetts.

✠ JOHN J. WRIGHT

SATAN. Edited by Père Bruno de Jésus-Marie, O.C.D. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1952. Pp. xxv+506. $5.50.

This composite study of Satan by thirty-one modern theologians and specialists is the most complete and up-to-date work on the devil. It is based upon a book originally published in French as part of the series: *Collection de psychologie religieuse—Etudes Carmelitaines*—and was edited by Father Bruno who also contributed an article of his own to this book: *The Confession of Boullan,* pp. 262-67. The studies which make up the present work fall into five parts, all of which represent two main groups. The first group deals with the theological Satan in its biblical, dogmatical, philosophical, and historical back-

ground. The second group deals with the psychological sphere of the devil's influence. To this second group belong medical studies of a very practical nature, as the article: *Pseudo-Possession,* by Jean Lhermite, and *Satan in our Day,* by Dom Alois Mager, O.S.B.

The otherwise very interesting article by J. Lhermite would seem to support the position which holds that the phenomena that were formerly attributed to the devil may be explained in terms of pathological abnormality: "Following the natural trend of their minds, *they* proceed to identify the devil with the sin from which they feel the most aversion and which they most deeply dread" (p. 298). Lhermite concludes his study by saying that "there exist genuine psychopathic states whose chief symptom is the notion that the moral or physical personality, or perhaps the entire personality, is possessed by the devil" (p. 299). A good answer to this one-sided study and conclusion is found in the article by Charles Moeller, which article is used as introduction to this book. "It is necessary," he says, "to make a synthesis of the theological devil, an identified personality, and the psychological devil, whom it is impossible to identify with any degree of certainty." Modern psychiatry and psychology often forget what is pointed out by Moeller, that "illness itself, even when purely pathological, is ground admirably suited to the devil's tactic. Even if he is not the direct cause of sensible disturbance, he can try to turn it to account as an occasion of sin." Another thing Moeller wants us to remember in this respect and this, too, flows from dogmatical and moral considerations, namely, that sickness and death are involved with the entry of sin into the world, and that the entry of sin into the world is involved with the malice of Satan himself.

The distinction between the personal Satan and the psychological Satan is really a distinction between diabolical possession in the strict sense and diabolical influence of a more general nature. This influence escapes the attention of the scientist who is solely interested in the abnormal condition of the individual. Most of the scientific studies on the field of psychology and psychiatry are often incomplete and misleading because they disregard the synthesis of reason and Faith, of the natural and preternatural elements in man's soul.

There is sufficient unity in this book in spite of the great variety of subjects, with Satan as common denominator, and the multitude of authors, among whom figure names like Herbert Thurston, S.J., A. Lefèvre, S.J., and Walter Farrell, O.P. The book turns the spotlight on him who loves darkness for his infernal work. Satan himself will not like this book, and this should be reason enough for every spiritual director to read and reread it.

PASCAL P. PARENTE

THE BRIGHTER VISION. By John V. Ryan. New York: McMullen, 1951. Pp. 249. $2.75.

If books were a matter of "by their jackets you will know them," then this book by a priest about a priest could be taken at the publisher's word as "a heart-warming first novel—in no way autobiographical." But as is so often the case, the proofreading of the book serves notice that any such plug is liable to be taken with a grain of salt or even a pinch of sugar.

That this is a first novel is more or less admissible. It shows the cracks that inevitably appear in constructions undertaken by an inexperienced builder. The dialogue goes along like piece-by-piece work, practically needing someone to enact it in order to put life into it. The style shows a studied attempt at easiness which might virtually (or virtuously) be equated with "engagingly readable simplicity." As a matter of incident and coincident, the story is novel enough without being much of a novel. In some spots it seems almost too fictional to be true, and in others too true to be fictional. Imagine an apparently sainted mother faking invalidism for twenty years just to make her one daughter and the priests wait on her right along—the daughter for being the cause of a dangerous childbirth, and the priest for being the occasion of it by his advice to have children even in the face of death. Or imagine a priest having an opinion, no more and no less, that a mother is wrong about bringing up her daughter in utter loneliness under the protective wall of a belief that everybody is blind like herself.

That this is a heart-warming treatment might be admitted in the end. The trouble is it takes 204 out of 249 pages for the heat to come up. For the first 17 chapters it is now entertaining, now hackeneyed as Fr. Michael O'Brien makes body but not soul contact with a grumpy pastor, a gossipy housekeeper, a hardened manufacturer, a rebellious student, a runaway marriage couple, and the above-noted selfish mothers. As for Father Michael's contact with himself, more often than not it is puzzling. He seems to be running into himself and around himself in pursuit of that brighter vision "to convert one and all," until he is forced to run away from himself in fear and confusion. Right here, perhaps, the weakness of the book turns out to be the strength of the story. The telltale merit of the writing comes from the impact of the lesson: woe to him who falls victim to the heresy of works! He saves others, himself he cannot save. At least not until he begins to look for results in himself first.

That this book is in no way autobiographical—it is a consummation devoutly to be wished. The happy ending doesn't take away from the fact that the unhappy beginning is due to a real lack of spirituality on

Father Michael's part, in spite of his adherence to the priestly forms. His life is therefore not to be taken as an ideal exposition of the priesthood, but rather as a real exposé of a type of priestliness. And what priest would want to settle for less than the ideal story of the ideal priest? In his own case, that is.

WILLIAM J. PAKUTKA

THE CONSIDERATE PRIEST. By Msgr. William J. Kerby. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1951. Pp. 228. $1.75.

In the *Menti Nostrae*, our Holy Father advises: "In our day, new situations and new problems have arisen, which demand of us deeper consideration and more constant attention." Circumstances of living are not always the same. Antecedent to this observation of the Holy Father, the late Msgr. William J. Kerby of The Catholic University of America wrote *The Considerate Priest* to assist the priests of the Depression days of the 1930's through the circumstances of that troubled time. Msgr. Kerby's work was pertinent then because the circumstances of life effected by the Depression brought about immoral conditions like planned parenthood, widespread petty larceny, undernourishment, and a nation-wide want of opportunity to fulfill normal human aspirations.

The current circumstances are similarly revolutionary. Basically, there is a kinship between the two eras because they both have their origin in the same nest of disillusionment, and their unusual problems seek for answers which only the grace of God and long hard study can give. But for all that, the gifts of Divine Grace, Faith, Hope, and Charity, will solve them as they always have and always will.

The Considerate Priest is a collection of subjects, each containing a fast principle, each capable of strengthening priestly character and each calculated to give growth to character. These principles are ageless, of course, but Msgr. Kerby expressed them uniquely. His commentaries, enriched by many graces of priestly life, a distinguished teaching tenure, and a wide experience gained in the development of our American Catholic sociological tradition, are superior in force, beauty and attractiveness.

This reviewer has lived through two wars and a Depression. As the day's events pile on one another, day after day, he feels that the demand for deeper consideration and more constant attention is, indeed, the theme of contemporary priestly life and a knowledge and practiec of what *The Considerate Priest* contains will answer the prescriptions of

the Holy Father. The shocking findings of *Southern Parish* are signs which cannot be ignored and must be courageously and humbly faced. These facts are not peculiar to *Southern Parish.* An "ostrich" attitude will not make them less.

The Priesthood of Jesus Christ is eternal. That is absolutely correct, but how effectively the world will be flavored by the "salt of the earth" depends on the priestly character of those whom Christ calls to be His very own in the unfolding of the Christian Redemption. Msgr. Kerby built a ladder of strong intellectual supports and sturdy spiritual rungs upon which a priest, though his tread be ever so heavy, can ascend to more effective apostolic goals. His formula, and it could be no other, was a high appreciation for our Christian ideals, much prayer and much self-denial.

The reader of *The Considerate Priest* will find principles of tremendous value to assist him in accepting the challenges of *Menti Nostrae.* Some of them are: "The Priest is primarily a citizen of the supernatural world, serving his interests among the children of men. He is under one law, that of Divine Faith. He is the representative of one institution that aims to adjust time to eternity, creature to Creator, sinner to Saviour. That institution is the Church. . . . Unless he sets before himself an ideal which will give measure, direction and value to effort, he will flounder in his spiritual life and make no progress. . . . A priest is one detail in the Priesthood. He should look upon himself through his vision of the Priesthood as a whole. . . . There can be no Christian life without a primary attitude of trust in virtue. . . . We pray when we care and we do not pray when we do not care. . . . The priest must want what he needs. What he wants depends on what he wishes to become, for this is his real answer to the call of Jesus Christ. . . . When our vigorous hold on spiritual truth is shown forth by caring, thinking or reading, the gift of understanding is assured to us and that understanding leads to doing, to the gradual adaptation of behaviour to spiritual ideals."

Msgr. Kerby's commentaries are not surpassed in poignancy of thought and simplicity of statement, even by Newman: "One who is truly spiritual is cultured. . . . The desire to grow, to put on Christ more completely, to conquer spiritual ignorance by insight, weakness by courage and determination, inadvertence and indifference by the call and example of Christ, should be found in every Christian heart. . . . An abiding sense of serenity and joy is found in the soul that grows towards Christ. It has begun to master the secrets of wisdom, security, poise and certainty, that are a foretaste of Beatitude in facing the mysteries of life."